

The Classical Review

MAY 1889.

LATIN TENSES IN *BO*, *BAM*.

PERHAPS it is from despair of finding any more satisfactory explanation that comparative philologists apparently still acquiesce in the old theory which represents those puzzling Latin futures in *bo* and imperfects in *bam* as compounded of the verbal stem and the auxiliary *fuō, fuam* (φύω; *bhávāmi*; Eng. *be*). R. Thurneysen repeats and supports this view in *Bezzenberger's Beiträge*, viii, p. 281, where he cites the relation of *superbus* to *ὑπερφ-ιάλος* (*sic*) as an instance in which the *bh* of *bhav* (*bhu*) has become *b* in the middle of a Latin word. The comparison of *superbus* with *ὑπερφ-ιάλος* is doubtless correct, but the connexion of both or either with *fuō, φύω* is as certainly unwarranted. It is at least far more probable that *superb(i)-us* and its Greek equivalent **ὑπερφ-ιος*, which has only survived¹ in the diminutive form *ὑπερφ-ι-αλος*, are formed directly from **ὑπερφι*, an instrumental case of *ὑπέρι*. The change of *-b(i)us* to *-bus* in *superbus* is paralleled by the change of *-b(i)us* to *-bus* in dative or ablative plural, and is due to the accent. *Dubius* (formed from instrumental **dubhī*) was originally oxyton, and hence the *i* remained; whereas in *supértijos* *j* following the accent vanished. Compare the relations of *κναιέν* and *κνήν*, &c., as explained by Fick (*Bezz. Beitr.* ix. 317 sqq.).

To the theory which derives *-bo -bam* from *fuō, fuam* there are serious objections. In the first place it assumes the loss of *u* (*v*), which in *fuī, φύω, bhávāmi* is a vital element

of the verbal organism. In the second place, it assumes the principle of auxiliary formations, which as far as we know were not a feature of the Indo-Germanic language. It is hardly to be supposed that any one now regards *amavi* as a corruption of *ama-fui*; and the view which found in the last syllable of *μνίθω* the 'root' of *τίθημι* has probably few supporters. The idea that *-bam, -bo* are auxiliary verbs seems hardly more plausible.

In examining these forms we can derive some help of a negative kind from Celtic. We cannot refuse to compare the Irish *b*-future with the Latin *b*-future. Now Latin *b* in the middle of a word may (where it is not parasitic) represent *bh, dh*, or a velar media. But as Irish *b* does not arise from a guttural or from *dh*, it follows that the *b* with which we are concerned must have come from *bh*.

Before attempting to account for this *bh* I must briefly refer to a general theory of the origin of verbs and nouns, which follows from the inevitable hypothesis of 'sentence-words.' According to this theory, verbs and nouns are the results of the differentiation of words (not roots but actually spoken words) which were originally, neither verbs nor nouns, or both verbs and nouns—*Infinite*, as they are called by Fick, to whose lucid exposition I may refer (*Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1881, p. 436). The word which expressed the idea 'drink' was not at first defined as 'I drink,' 'thou drinkest' or 'the drink,' but might bear any one of these determinations according to the gesture (&c.) by which it was accompanied. The process by which these originally indifferent words were differentiated into the various parts of speech, with declension and conjugation, is one of the

¹ There are many cases in which one language has preserved only the diminutive form. For example, *ἀστὴρ*: *stella*, *ἰὼν*: *viola*; conversely, *δάκτυλος*, *varius*: *αἰδῶλος* (if I am right in explaining *αἰδῶλος* = *φασιδῶλος*, *variolus*).

chief problems which the science of language has to solve. Fick has shown that the inflexion of *léigmi*, *léigsi*, &c., rests on the words, *léiqi*, *ligéni*, *liqai*, *liqdhai*, which are in form noun-cases. It follows that we may in general expect to find the same formative elements, which appear in the declensions of nouns, appearing in conjugations of verbs.

An obvious instance is the case of the futures and aorists in *s* (*fazo*, *rexī*, *λύσω*, *ἐλυσσά*, *bhaviṣyāmi*, &c.). We need not hesitate to regard this *s* as essentially the same as that *s* which appears in Sanskrit loc. plur. *su*,¹ in Greek locatives in *σι*, and in dative plurals in *s*.

On the same principle I propose to identify the *b* of *ibo*, *ibam* with the *b* in *tibei*, *nobis*, *ibus* (*is*), *rebus*, with *φ* in *ιβη*, *σφι*, *βίηφι*, with *bh* in the Ssk. cases *bhyam* (*tā-*

¹ In Greek this form has survived in *μεταξύ* (basis **μεταξ*, **μεταξ* : *μέτασσα* : *πέριξ* : *περισσός*). I conjecture that it also survives in *αἰσυν-μήτης* (*αἰσυν* for *αἰσυν* : *αἰσυν* = *αἰσυν*, Osc. *acteis* = *partis*, cf. *aestumo*).

bhyam, *asmābhyam*), *bhyām* (dual), *bhyas*, *bhis*, with *b* in Slav. *tebē*, *sebē*. I submit that 'Infinites' of the type *léiqbhī*, *liqbhēi*, were in use before nouns and verbs had come into existence as distinct parts of speech. In the Greek forms, and in Sanskrit, we have *bhi* (*bhij-*); in the Latin singular forms (*tibi*, *sibi*, *ibi*, *-cubi*, *ubi*), and in Slavonic we have an unmistakable *bhei*.² Latin *bus*, which we can hardly refuse to identify with Ssk. *bhyas*, was originally *bhjos*, we may similarly assume the loss of *i* in the terminations *bo* and *bam*.

Along with such words as *bherē*, *ei*, *deiki*, there existed other forms, such as *ēibhi*, *ēibhijō*, and from these were formed systems of verbal tenses; e.g. *eibhio* (*ibo*), *eibhiam*, (*ibam*), while they also entered into nominal declensions.³

JOHN B. BURY.

² Lat. *beis* (*nobis*) : *bei* (*tibi*) : Ssk. *bhis* : *φῖ*.

³ Another instance of this principle is the imperative in *dhi* (*φrudhī*, *κλυθι*), as compared with cases in *θι* (*οἰκοθι*).

NOTES ON ARISTOTLE'S *ETHICS*.

I. 5,8, πολλοὶ λόγοι καταβέβληται πρὸς αὐτὰ is, I believe, commonly translated 'many arguments have been laid as a foundation to prove them,' rather a bold metaphor from *καταβάλλειν κρηπίδα*. I now find that Ramsauer translates 'have been published,' giving as proofs the expressions *καταβεβλημένα παιδείσεις, μαθήματα* = the common, current studies from *Politics* 1337b21, 1338a36. I had previously arrived at his conclusion independently, comparing Plato *Soph.* 232d, τὰ γε μὴν... ἃ δεῖ ἀντειπεῖν δεδημοσιωμένα πον καταβέβληται γεγραμμένα τῷ βουλευμένῳ μαθεῖν, where the form of expression reminds one of the original legal use of *καταβάλλειν*, 'file, deposit among the public records' (see L. & S.), from which the general meaning 'publish' was derived.

I. 8,10, τὸ γὰρ ᾗδεσθαι τῶν ψυχικῶν. It certainly seems as if this must mean 'The feeling of pleasure is a mental state,' not bodily, according to the doctrine laid down in X. 3,6. Ramsauer quotes this, but adds with characteristic candour that he cannot see the bearing of the remark on the passage. With these words omitted the general meaning is perfectly clear, and the expression, as I think, more pointed than the commentators have suspected. 'The life of the good man

is in its very nature pleasant;' here come the debated words, then 'whatever one is called a lover of, that is pleasant to him; thus a horse to the lover of horses, a spectacle to the lover of sights; and, in the same way, just acts are pleasant to the lover of justice, and virtuous acts generally to the lover of virtue.' It is clear that to prove his general position, ἐκάστω ἐστὶν ἡδὺ, πρὸς ὃ λέγεται φιλοστοιχῶτος, he finds it best to begin with the simplest instances, material ones, e.g. a horse, a spectacle; then from what all admit in these obvious cases there is an inference to the less obvious case where the thing loved is immaterial, e.g. virtue. Perhaps then he insists on pleasure being a mental state to show that there is no need that the object exciting it should be a material one; e.g. if pleasure were really ἀναπλήρωσις of the body—the opinion he refutes in Bk. X.—the exciting object could only be material food. I once thought the dubious words could be rendered 'the feeling of pleasure is found in connexion with psychical objects' (as well as material), e.g. in connexion with τὰ κατ' ἀρετὴν (which are ψυχικά ἐνέργειαι, I. 8,2); now, however, I think this interpretation impossible, for allowing there were no objection to the meaning given in it to τὰ ψυχικά, Aristotle

would probably have written τὸ ἡδεσθαὶ καὶ περὶ τὰ ψυχικά ἐστιν.

V. 4. The exact conception of διορθωτικὸν δίκαιον having given much trouble particularly in its relation to ἐκούσια συναλλάγματα, I am surprised that no one—as far as I know—has examined with sufficient care the instances given of its application. The doubt is, how exactly this kind of justice can apply to ἐκούσια συν. (such as ὀνή, πῶσις, &c. ch. 2,13), with regard to which it is expressly said in ch. 4,13, ἀδειαν ἔδωκεν ὁ νόμος. The difficulty is cleared up by an exacter explanation of ἀποστέρησεν (4,3), which is a case to which διορθ. δίκ. applies. For ἀποστέρειν—as scholars know, though the meaning is not given in L. & S. 6th edn.—is the exact opposite of ἀποδιδόναι, the latter being = to pay one's debts (this is known to L. & S.), the former = to refuse to pay one's debts. If instances are wanted, take the case of the rascally borrower (this was a χῆρσις, loan without interest) in Dem. c. *Nicostratum*, § 13, λαβὼν δὲ τὸ ἀργυρίον οὐχ ὅπως χάριν τινά μοι ἀποδιδόναι ὡς εὖ ἔπαθεν, ἀλλ' εὐθέως ἐπεβούλευσέ μοι ἢ ἀποστέρησέ μοι τὰ ἀργυρία, or the case of the unfortunate lender (this was a δανεισμός, loan on interest) in c. *Pantaenetum*, § 53, 'through having been often a borrower as well as, in this special instance, a lender, I, too, know these gentlemen (i.e. the money-lenders, for whom it was said no Athenian jury would find a verdict), and I don't love them, οὐ μέντοι γ' ἀποστέρω μὰ Δι' οὐδὲ συκοφαντῶ. Thus the ἐκούσ. συναλ. to which διορθ. δίκ. applies were—to speak strictly—συναλ. in which the ἀρχή was ἐκούσιος, V. 2,13, that is contracts with the formation of which the law did not interfere; but when one of the parties had derived from them the benefit he expected, then if he refused to pay the 'consideration' he had agreed on, the law stepped in and said he should not have all the gain and the other all the loss. Mr. Jackson translates ἀποστέρησεν by 'defrauded,' which is, of course, as correct and suitable a version as any one word can be; he does not think it necessary to give any note. May I say it is much to be desired that Mr. Jackson would again devote his great knowledge and ability to the interpretation of the *Ethics*? One word more. While Mr. Jackson's interpretation of Bk. V. 5 (of which Ramsauer, unfortunately for himself, is ignorant) seems irrefragable, I regret he should provoke opposition by describing its subject as a third kind of justice co-ordinate with distributive and corrective, when Aristotle has expressly said there are but two kinds of

justice, διανεμ. and διορθ. It is quite true that Aristotle speaks of τὸ τοιοῦτον δίκαιον, τὸ ἀντιπεπονηθός; but this δίκαιον, like πατρικόν and δεσποτικόν δίκαιον, is not ταῦτόν, but only ὅμοιον to the real justice, the ἀπλῶς or πολιτικόν δίκαιον. For to Aristotle the real justice can only be had in the state, regulated and enforced by law, cf. *Pol.* 1282b14, 'The end in all arts is good, and greatest good and especially good in the supreme art, that of statesmanship, ἐστὶ δὲ πολιτικὸν ἀγαθὸν τὸ δίκαιον, τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶ τὸ κοινὴ συμφέρον,' also *Pol.* 1283a37, κοινωνικὴν ἀρετὴν εἶναι φημὲν τὴν δικαιοσύνην, ἣ πάσας ἀναγκαῖον ἀκολουθεῖν τὰς ἄλλας, and *Pol.* 1253a36, ἣ δὲ δικαιοσύνη πολιτικόν. That particular analogue of real political justice, the formula of which is τὸ ἀντιπεπονηθός, might, we see from *Pol.* I., have been named χρηματιστικόν or κτηρικόν δίκαιον, and would be a branch of οἰκονομικόν δίκαιον. There is then nothing strange, as Mr. Jackson thinks, in the words πῶς ἔχει τὸ ἀντιπεπονηθός πρὸς τὸ δίκαιον εἰρηται being placed just before a description of πολιτικόν δίκαιον, that being the true justice, while 'commercial justice' is only a δίκαιον καθ' ὁμοίότητα.

IX. 4,4. I am almost ashamed to pretend I can have anything fresh to say on this well-known crux. Fritzsche's and Peters' interpretations of γινόμενος ἄλλος ('becoming older' or 'better') are impossible. Ramsauer gives up the passage. To me Grant's interpretation seems correct as far as it goes, but further explanation is needed. 'Every one wishes himself what is good, but does not desire to become another, and then for that new creature to have everything,' i.e. Every one wishes the best for himself, but not at the price of losing his personality; he wants the good for himself now as he is (taking ἀλλ' ὡς ὅτι ποτ' ἐστίν as opposed to γινόμενος ἄλλος, and throwing ἔχει γὰρ καὶ νῦν ὁ θεὸς τὰγαθόν into a parenthesis—I will discuss this later); and the intellect is what each man really is (δόξαι δ' ἂν τὸ νοοῦν ἕκαστος εἶναι); therefore he must take care of his intellect. Now to most of this, except the use of the word 'personality,' an advance and refinement on the simple conceptions of Aristotle, I fully assent. But is Grant right about the conclusion of the whole matter, 'therefore he must take care of his intellect'? It is hard to see how such a direction is implied in the passage immediately under consideration, which is not hortatory in tone; and in fact it is irrelevant to the object of the chapter, which is to prove that the relation of a man to his friend is similar to the relation of the good man (ὁ ἐπαικός)—

not of others—to himself. For instance the mark of the relation of friendship is that man *βούλεται τὰγαθὰ* to the friend for the friend's own sake; now this is the feeling of ὁ σπουδαῖος towards himself, he wishes well to himself and for the sake of himself, i.e. for the sake of his intellect, which is the man's self. Now comes the debated passage, which I interpret 'it is true *every one* (ἐκαστος) wishes well to himself, but suppose he became different he would wish himself well no longer.' Now the man who is not perfect actually does become different. I call attention here to the parallel passage X. 7, 9. 'The intellect is the very self of the man; it is absurd then (Aristotle's strongest expression of confidence in his position) to choose not one's own life but some one else's,' which is what one does if one does not live κατὰ νοῦν; therefore the imperfect man, when and as far as he gives up living κατὰ νοῦν, has 'assumed the life of another' (in the language of Bk. X.), has 'become another' (in the language of Bk. IX.), and his former

self is in no way interested in his present self; the A. of yesterday no longer wishes well to the A. of to-day; therefore the common man cannot be said *βούλεσθαι τὰγαθὰ ἑαυτῷ*, but only the good man; and therefore only good men (and men in so far as they suppose themselves good, and therefore unchanging, IX. 4, 2) feel towards themselves as men feel towards their friends.

The rather extraordinary reference to God also becomes intelligible. God is *like* the good man (συγγενής, φίλος, X. 8, 13), inasmuch as he is pure νοῦς and necessarily unchanging; in fact, in a measure, the perfect man lives the life of God (ἀθανατίζει, οὐκ ἀνθρώπινα φρονεί), since he obeys τὸ θεῖον in himself. But we cannot say of God *βούλεται ἑαυτῷ τὰγαθὰ*, for he *has* τὰγαθόν already. The words ἀλλ' ὡν ὁ τι ποτ' ἐστίν are not absolutely needed to explain the assertion about God, and had better be kept, as above suggested, to express the opposite of ἄλλος γενόμενος.

J. SOLOMON.

1094 b, 19. ἕτεροι δὲ δι' ἀνδρείαν. These words have been suspected on the ground that an ἀγαθόν, not a καλόν, is required. Rassow's διὰ φιλίαν is, however, open to nearly the same objection, for φιλία is a καλόν as well as an ἀγαθόν (cf. 1155 a, 28). If any change is required, I would suggest ἕτεροι δὲ δι' ἀρχήν. Ἀρχή is very common in lists of ἐκτὸς ἀγαθὰ.

1096 b, 5. πιθανώτερον δὲ εἰκόσιν οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι: κ.τ.λ. 'It is more plausible to say that the One is good than that the Good is one.' This apparently belongs to the earlier part of the discussion. Susemihl regards 1096 a, 34 ἀπορήσει... 1096 b, 5 ἐφημέρον as a marginal note. Would it not be simpler to put 1096 b, 5 sqq. after 1096 a, 34 γυμναστική? Perhaps the present position of the sentence is due to the 'editor' having supposed that there was some reference to the view of Speusippos and the Pythagoreans that the Good was not eternal, for which see *Met.* 1072 b, 30 and 1091 a, 34. But it seems hard to find such a reference in the sentence as we have it.

1097 a, 27. πλοῦτον αἰλοὺς καὶ ὅλως τὰ ὄργανα. The meaningless αἰλοὺς has been suggested by ὄργανα. Bonitz conjectures φίλους, but, though φίλοι may be ὄργανα (cf. 1099 b, 1), we want something which is always an ὄργανον. I would suggest δούλους.¹

¹ I find that I have been anticipated here by Mr. Bywater in the last number of the *Journal of Philology*.

1098 a, 4. τούτου δὲ τὸ μὲν ὡς ἐπιειθὲς λόγῳ, τὸ δ' ὡς ἔχον καὶ διανοούμενον. These words are condemned by Grant, Rassow and Susemihl. But would it be sufficiently clear without them that there is an ambiguity in τὸ λόγον ἔχον? In a remark of this kind the absence of grammatical connexion need not trouble us. In a modern work it would have been put in a foot-note with a reference to 1102 b, 25 sqq. The καὶ in the next sentence (διττῶς δὲ καὶ ταύτης λεγομένης) is an undesigned testimony to the genuineness of the words. Rassow and Susemihl bracket it also, but what interpolator would have thought of it?

1099 b, 5. εἰ τῷ πάγκακοι παῖδες εἴην ἢ φίλοι. The words ἢ φίλοι are omitted by the Greek commentators and the inferior MSS. and are bracketed by Susemihl. It is true that Aristotle has not mentioned πολυφιλία καὶ χρηστοφιλία with the rest as he does in *Rhet.* i, 5, but μονώτης in the line above shows he had it in his mind, and that is enough to justify ἢ φίλοι here, supported as it is both by K^b and L^b.

1099 b, 23. μάλιστα κατὰ τὴν ἀρίστην. This is possibly right, but μάλιστα <τὰ> κατὰ τὴν ἀρίστην is easy and tempting.

1099 b, 26. ψυχῆς ἐνέργεια [κατ' ἀρετὴν] ποιά τις. I believe κατ' ἀρετὴν to be a gloss on ποιά τις. Otherwise it is hard to see what ποιά τις could mean. Surely not τελεία, for that is a ποσὸν not a ποιόν.

1100 a, 4. καὶ ἀρετῆς [τελείας] καὶ βίον

τελείον. When ἀρετὴ τελεία stands by itself, as in 1101 *a*, 14, it seems to mean ἀρετὴ which has had time to develop ἐν βίῳ τελείῳ. It can hardly be 'complete (i.e. all) ἀρετὴ' for εὐδαιμονία is ἐνέργεια κατὰ τὴν ἀρίστην. But if so it cannot stand here with βίου τελείον immediately following.

1100 *a*, 6. εὐθηνούντα. It is admitted that εὐθηνούντα is the Attic form of this word. Now it occurs according to Bonitz's Index nine times in Aristotle (apart from the present passage), and in only one of them, viz. *Pol.* 1258 *b*, 17, does Bekker not give some variant which shows that the original reading must have been εὐθενεῖν and not εὐθηνεῖν. The variant is generally εὐσθενεῖν, more rarely the correct form εὐθενεῖν. So in the present passage *K*^b, the oldest MS., has εὐσθενούντα. We must also add two passages in the *Problemata*, 862, *a*, 11 and 925 *a*, 3, where Bekk. has εὐσθενεῖ without any variant though εὐθενεῖ is clearly right. So too we must read εὐθένεια for εὐθηνία Bekk.

in *Rhet.* 1360 *b*, 16 (εὐσθένεια *Q* *Y*^b *Z*^b) and εὐθένεια for εὐθηνία in *Hist. An.* 602, *a*, 15 (εὐθένεια *C*^a: εὐσθένεια cett.). Aristotle is much more of an Attic writer than sometimes appears from Bekker's text.

1101 *a*, 14, κατ' ἀρετὴν τελείαν. Another case of ἀρετὴ τελεία with βίος τέλειος following. But Eucken has shown that 16 μὴ...βίον is wanted after 17 οὕτως.

1101 *a*, 34. συλλογιστέον δὴ καὶ ταύτην τὴν διαφορὰν. 'We must take into account this difference as well.' But the Paraphrase, σκεπτέον οὖν περὶ τῆς διαφορᾶς, distinctly favours συλλογιστέον δὴ καὶ ταύτην τὴν διαφορὰν, *L*^b *O*^b *H*^a Ald. Ar. Vet. Int. For συλλογιστέον i.g. σκεπτέον, see *L. S. s.v.* ii, 2 and examples there.

1101 *b*, 1. εἰκε γάρ: εἰκεν οὖν *L*^b. Surely this points to εἰκε γοῦν which would be very appropriate here with its mixed illative and restrictive force.

JOHN BURNET.

NOTES ON LATIN POETS.

PERSIUS III. 39—43.

Anne magis Siculi gemuerunt aera iuueni
et magis auratis pendens laquearibus ensis
purpureas subter ceruices terruit, 'imius,
imius praecipites' quam si sibi dicat, et intus
palleat infelix, quod proxima nesciat uxor.

'The ghastly inward paleness, which is a mystery, even to the wife of the bosom' Conington. I can imagine no worse nonsense than *inward paleness*. What is paleness? It is one among the outward symptoms of inward disorder: it exists in the complexion, nowhere else in the frame of a living man. When a man is dissected, then his inward parts may have this colour or that: till then they have none at all. And if we are to talk about this inconceivable malady, it will be superfluous and yet at the same time inadequate to say that it is unguessed by the wife of the bosom. It doubtless is: much more than that, it is and must be unguessed by the invalid himself: he cannot possibly know that there is anything the matter with him. I need only mention and dismiss the idea that *palleat* can mean merely *fears*: that sense, if wanted, must be introduced by the emendation *infelix paeat*. Conington in his commentary explains with natural hesitation '*intus*

palleat, not a very intelligible expression at first sight, appears to include the notions of *depth* and *secrecy*;' but as those notions are included in the perfectly intelligible expression *quod proxima nesciat uxor*, the other becomes more wonderful than ever.

I suppose that when we read the passage negligently, without pausing to realise how absurd it is, we carry away a vague impression that it means *paleness from an inward cause unknown to the wife of the bosom*. Of course it does not; but it is an almost imperceptible alteration of what does:

et ulcus

palleat infelix, quod proxima nesciat uxor.

The construction is the same as *I.* 124 *Eupolidem palles*, you are pale from reading Eupolis. The metaphor is frequent enough: take for an instance *Cic. de off.* III. 85 'hunc tu quas conscientiae labe in animo censes habuisse, quae uulnera?'

MARTIAL XII. 3, 1—4.

Ad populos mitti qui nuper ab urbe solebas
 ibis, io, Roman nunc peregrine liber,
 auriferi de gente Tagi tetricique Salonis,
 dat patrios manes quae mihi terra potens.

'Obwol hier nur das erste und das letzte Wort verdorben zu sein scheinen, ist eine völlig befriedigende Herstellung doch bis jetzt noch nicht gelungen' is Friedlaender's note on v. 4. As to the first word, we shall see presently; but I do not find any intrinsic fault in the last: the old conjecture *parens* which Friedlaender wrongly assigns to Hirschfeld is easy and may be true; yet Lucan X. 324 has the same phrase, 'hinc, Abaton quam nostra uocat ueneranda uetustas, | *terra potens* primos sentit percussa tumultus,' and Virgil seems to explain it in *Aen.* I. 531 '*terra antiqua, potens armis atque ubere glabrae.*' There can however be no doubt that something is wrong somewhere. The traditional interpretation of the verse was 'in qua scilicet terra conditi sunt cineres meorum parentum, et quae patria mea est.' This would be very good sense; but to extort it from the text is impossible, and to introduce it is difficult: at least I can devise no gentler measures

than Gilbert's '*iam patrios manes quae mihi terra tegit*' or Munro's '*hac, patrios manes quae mihi terra fouet.*'

I doubt then whether this after all is what Martial meant; and since *quae* is given only by one family of MSS. while the others read *quod*, I should look for the corruption where the testimony varies, and offer this instead:

dat patrios amnes quos mihi terra potens.

That this use of *dat* is a roundabout way to convey the simple sense *the rivers of my country* I will not at all deny; but here is its fellow from Ovid, *ex Pont.* IV. 16, 43, '*maternos Cottas cui Messallasque paternos, | Maxime, nobilitas ingeminata dedit.*' The two words *amnes* and *manes* are much confounded: in Virgil's MSS. alone I have counted five examples, *georg.* I. 115, IV. 293, *Aen.* IV. 34, 490, V. 634: Prop. I. 1, 23 I think contains another.

JUVENAL IX. 130—134.

Ne trepida, numquam pathicus tibi derit amicus
 stantibus et saluis his collibus. undique ad illos
 conuenient et carpentis et nauibus omnes
 qui digito scalpunt uno caput. altera maior
 spes superest. tu tantum erucis inprime dentem.

Nothing is here obscure, except this: that when you expect to arrive at the sentiment *your present trade will improve in the future* you come instead to the words *altera maior spes superest*, in which *altera* is quite inexplicable, for the *spes* in question, though *maior*, is not *altera* but *prorsus eadem*. The scholiast sees the difficulty of the word and makes an honest attempt to explain it with '*multos inberbes habes tibi crescentes*'; but that is wholly foreign to the matter. Ruperti expounds '*spes altera, futuri temporis, longe maior superest tibi*'; but all *spes* is *futuri temporis*: that sense does not reside in *altera*. 'Dir blühen Aussichten in der Zukunft zu einer viel bessern Kundschaft' writes Heinrich: that, as I said, is the sentiment you expect; but *altera* is untranslated, because untranslatable.

But it is hardly worth while to puzzle our brains over a reading which certainly was not the reading of the archetype. It is only

one family of MSS. that gives the passage thus: the other, represented by our best MS., the Pithoeanus, adds after 134 this verse:

gratus eris, tu tantum faucis inprime dentem.

The variation of the two stocks enables us here as often elsewhere to write down what stood in the common parent of both:

spes superest } tu tantum erucis inprime
 gratus eris } dentem.

Out of this one copyist made two verses by iterating the end of the line; the other made one verse by throwing away the more embarrassing of the two commencements. But a critic, had there been critics in the earth in those days, would have known better than either. Since *altera maior spes superest* merely fails to give a fitting sense, while *altera maior gratus eris* fails to give any sense whatever, it follows that *spes*

superest must be dismissed as a conjecture and that *altera maior gratus eris* is the genuine ruin of the words of Juvenal. Those words I suppose were these :

undique ad illos
conuenient et carpentis et nauibus omnes
qui digito scalpunt caput uno: derit amator;
gratus eris. tu tantum erucis inprime dentem.

I will deal first with the palaeographical details. One of the absurdities by which the overworked brain of the copyist avenges itself on the author copied is that inversion of two syllables which transforms *der-it* into *d-it-er*. I cite here only the closest of parallels: Ovid *Ibis* 246 *it-er* for *er-it*, *met.* XII. 306 *me-ne-la-us* for *me-la-ne-us*, *trist.* V. 6, 11 *po-li-da-rius* for *po-da-li-rius*, Verg. *Aen.* XI. 711 *ra-pu* for *pu-ra*, Stat. *silu.* IV. 4, 79 *e-ri-get* for *e-ge-ri-t*: in Juvenal, IV. 83 *ge-re-nti* for *re-ge-nti* and VI. 541 *o-ri-si-s* for *o-si-ri-s* might be assigned to the same class. Now the difference between *diteramator* and *alteramator* is not worth considering, so frequently is *d* confused with *a*, *i* with *l*, and *t* with *i*; and the scribes who when they found at VIII. 148 a hexameter ending with *sufflamine multo consul* altered the order to *multo sufflamine* would not scruple here to write *uno caput* for *caput uno* when metre required it. Buecheler, I ought to say, already suspected the presence of *amator*.

The sense is plain enough: never fear a scarcity of Virrones while the seven hills

abide; they will flock over sea and land out of all the world to Rome: it is Naevoli that will be scarce: you will be in high demand: only make you ready against it. The order of the words *caput uno* which I restore is a deliberate imitation of Calvus' notorious epigram, 'Magnus, quem metuunt omnes, digito *caput uno* | scalpit.' The clausula *derit amator* is repeated from the companion Satire II. 168, 'non numquam *derit amator*,' and here serves of course as a pointed opposition to the 'numquam pathicus tibi *derit amicus*' of 130.

I may add here two notes on passages which can be dealt with briefly.

VII. 22.

siqua aliunde putas rerum spectanda tuarum
praesidia.

This is the reading of P. But *specto* is not thus used; so most editors take *expectanda* from the other MSS. I should think *speranda* nearer to our best authority; and it seems to have been read by the scholiast who writes 'si aliunde magis praesidium *speras* per carmina quam a principe.'

XV. 75.

terga fuga celeri praestant instantibus Ombis.

But P has *fugat*, which points to *fugae*: see for instance Prop. IV. 2, 54, 'turpi terga dedisse *fugae*': *inst. Omb.* will then be abl. abs.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

THE TERMINATION—ENSIS.

READERS of Velleius Paterculus will remember the passage (ii. 51) in which he mentions the extraordinary rise of Cornelius Balbus—'illis incrementis fecit viam, quibus non Hispaniensis natus sed Hispanus in triumphum et pontificatum adsurgeret, fieretque ex privato consul.' Evidently Velleius is laying stress upon the fact that Balbus was not merely a man of Italian blood settled in Spain, but a native Spaniard. It is the distinction between an Anglo-Indian and a Hindoo. As however this special use of the termination does not appear to have been anywhere adequately discussed (the fullest discussion I know, and it is inadequate, is in Reisig's *Vorlesungen*, i. 234), I have thought it worth while to put the chief illustrative passages together in the hope that some better scholar than

myself, with access to one of 'the three scholars' libraries of Britain' (Prof. Ramsay in February's *Classical Review*)¹ may further

¹ In Manchester, where I write this, the case has much improved since Prof. Mayor wrote (*Bibliographical Clue to Latin Literature*, 1875): 'Hear the quiet complaint of a German resident (*Journal of Philology*, vi. 27): "The bulk of this paper was written in Manchester, where there is no large library." He was compelled to have recourse to the private library of a friend.' The Free Library, which is admirable of its kind, now contains the standard English books in almost all departments; the Owens College library, though still weak in periodical literature—e.g. no *Philologus*, *Hermes* and *Rheinisches Museum* far from complete—has made enormous strides; and finally the ancient and beautiful Chetham Library, under the scholarly direction of Mr. H. H. Howorth, has not only made a special point of obtaining the great historical collections—Pertz, Migne, &c.—but very rarely refuses to get a book of real importance which is suggested by any serious student.

elucidate the point. Other instances of 'Hispaniensis' are Livy xxiii. 48, Hispaniensi exercitui = 'the Roman army serving in Spain,' xxiii. 28, xxxix. 20 and 38, the adjective in each of these cases occurring with 'exercitus.' Florus ii. 13, 23 also has 'Hispanienses Pompeii exercitus.' The grammarian Charisius (*Gramm. Lat.* i. 106) explains: 'Cum dicimus Hispanos, nomen nationis ostendimus; cum autem Hispanienses, cognomen eorum qui provinciam Hispanam incolunt, etsi non sunt Hispani.' Pompeius (*Gramm. Lat.* v. 144) says: '*Siculus et Siciliensis invenimus: quae ratio est? Sardus et Sardinienensis: quamquam in Cicerone in Scurliana invenimus istam discretionem de Sardis et Sardinensibus, ut illos incolas, illos advenas doceat.*' Porphyry's comment on Horace *Sat.* i. 3, 3, is, 'Adnotandum et *Sardum et Sardinensem* dici posse. Nam Lucilius *Sardinensem* dixit in sexto satirarum: *Sardinensem terram.* . . . Nonnulli tamen veterum Grammaticorum sic appellationes has diviserunt ut *Sardum* putarent dici qui in Sardinia natus sit, *Sardinensem* autem incolas Sardiniae.' (It should be noted that 'incolas' is here used, as always in inscriptions, in the technical sense of a settler who is not a native, = *μέτοικος*; in the passage from Pompeius previously quoted 'advena' is used in that sense, and 'incola' is the native inhabitant.) Festus, s.v. *Corinthienses*, has: 'Corinthienses ex eo dici coeperunt, ex quo coloni Corinthum sunt deducti, qui ante Corinthii sunt dicti; quam consuetudinem servamus etiam quum Romanenses¹ et Hispanenses et Sicilienses negotiatores dicimus, qui in alienis civitatibus negotiantur.' The same use appears to occur in one of the electoral inscriptions of Pompeii. Henzen, 6974: 'M. Epidium Sabinum aed. Campanienses rog.'—i.e. men living in Campania, at Pompeii, who were not Campanians. In an essay by the Abbé Ducis on 'Le Passage d'Annibal du Rhône aux Alpes' (1869) I find the following (p. 87): 'La langue Latine est riche et logique dans la variété de ses désinences. L'épigraphie de nos Alpes reproduit les

All this however does not amount to a 'scholar's library' in Prof. Ramsay's sense, and the student of any special department of antiquity must still buy at least three-fourths of the books he needs, if he lives in Manchester.

¹ 'Romanensis' occurs on lamps of Puteoli, *Eph. Epig.* ii. 92.

mots de *Alpicus*, qui signifie un montagnard, *Alpensis*, un citoyen de la province des Alpes, *Alpinus*, un homme originaire des Alpes.' I have looked through the indices of the Berlin *Corpus*, so far as published, without finding 'Alpensis,' but I have not been able to consult either the special epigraphic collections for the Maritime Alps or the *Révue épigraphique du Midi de la France*. I hope that some other student may be able to find examples of the interesting use thus vouched for by the Abbé Ducis. Perhaps, also, someone may be able to suggest an explanation for the 'Cicinenses,' 'Quirinenses,' 'Parienses,' in Henzen, 7216. Henzen himself gives them up. The 'QQ. corporis treiectus togatensium' (*Eph. Epig.* i. 217) is also curious. Some relation between 'togatensis' and 'togatus' presumably exists; but what is it? It should perhaps be added finally that in the case of town-names the termination 'ensis' is of course—as in Atheniensis, Carthaginiensis, and a multitude of others—frequently the only one, and carries no special signification with it. Sometimes the Romans themselves doubted in a given case whether there was any distinction at all between this and an alternative termination. 'Ait sic Caesar in libris analogiae: "duae sunt Albae . . . ; volentes Romani discretionem facere, istos Albanos dixerunt, illos Albenses". . . . Plinius Secundus negat et ait sic: "indifferenter haec inveniantur." (Pompeius *loc. cit.*) In the famous Genoa boundary inscription (Orelli 3121), 'Genuates' and 'Genuenses,' 'Langates' and 'Langenses' seem to be used quite indifferently. All that can be said is that the termination 'ensis' appears to be the favourite one in the provinces, when the place signified is either a Roman *municipium* or a Roman colony. It suggested to the provincial ear, though it did not certify, a closer connection with Rome than ordinary. The geographical list in Henzen's supplementary volume to Orelli bears out this assertion, and forms like 'Victricensis' (formed from the 'Victorious' legion which colonized Camalodunum), 'Julienses'² (inhabitants of Vasio, which was surnamed Julia), are also interesting from this point of view.

WILLIAM T. ARNOLD.

² See Hirschfeld's *Gallische Studien*, i. 301.

GREEK BURLESQUE EPIC.

Corpusculum Poesis Epicae Graecae Ludibundae. Fasciculus prior continens Parodiae Epicae et Arcestrati Reliquias a PAULO BRANDT editas. Leipzig. Teubner. 1888. 3 Mk.

THIS volume completes a collection of the fragments of parodies and trifling or satiric poems in hexameter verse, begun by Wachsmuth in his *Sillographi Graeci*. It contains three works which may be called important, the *Batrachomyomachia*, the Ἀττικὸν δαίπνον of Matro, and the *Hedypathia* of Arcestratus. Besides these it puts together—the first time that this has been thoroughly done—the few fragments in the same style by Hipponax, Hegemon, Euboeus and other unknown writers. These, like the fragments of Matro and Arcestratus, are chiefly gathered from Athenaeus, and Kaibel's improved text has been of great service: the editor also had the advantage of Kaibel's yet unpublished notes besides his two published volumes.

There are good indices, including one very useful index of the passages in Homer and Hesiod parodied or used by these writers. This index shows some interesting facts: thus the *Iliad* is imitated about three times as often as the *Odyssey*, a fact which gives undesigned and strong testimony to the relative popularity of the two poems with the average Greek reader: and in both *Iliad* and *Odyssey* the first half of the poem is much more quoted than the second. It does not appear that any help towards determining the Homeric text is given by the parodists: they use Homer so freely and loosely that it is impossible to argue from their lines to his. See however the remarks on p. 59.

A very full apparatus criticus to the *Batrachomyomachia* is given, distinguishing between the Vatican and Laurentian families of MSS. But the editor, perhaps wisely, does not attempt to reconstruct the original form of the poem of Pigres. The interpolations are so frequent and so various, and have in so many cases displaced portions of the genuine work, that he is content to leave the text as it is, with a rather complicated system of brackets showing his conclusions as to the origin of the different parts. In the case of a new edition being called for it might add clearness if the genuine lines were printed in a different type.

A few remarks must be made on the minor fragments before the Ἀττικὸν δαίπνον and the Ἡδὺπάθεια are spoken of. Brandt defends the statement of Aristotle that Hegemon of Thasos was the first writer of parodies by saying that the fragment of Hipponax is not properly a parody of Homer, but a *bona fide* use of the Homeric form of verse to add gravity and force to a personal attack. This distinction is untenable. Hipponax could have attacked the subject of his parody with much greater point and bitterness in his favourite choliambics. A man who is attacking in earnest does not waste time in making up facetious Homeric epithets: this is the light touch of parody proper. Aristotle's words need not be pressed to mean more than that Hegemon was the first to write parodies systematically on a large scale. In the fragment of Hegemon, l. 1—

Ἐς δὲ Θάσον μ' ἔλθόντα μετewρίζοντες ἔβαλλον
πολλοῖσι σπελέθουσι—

Brandt rightly keeps μετewρίζοντες against the μέγα κράζοντες of Jacobs, but his explanation of it as referring to the gesture of a stone-thrower is impossible. It seems to mean 'making me skip,' as in the common phrase μετewρίζεν τὰ σκέλη or τὸν πόδα. In l. 6 for λῆμ' ἀνέπεισε γέροντα we should probably read λιμός ἐπεισε γέροντα, ἀνέπεισε having been inadvertently repeated from l. 3 and the metre then mended at the expense of λιμός. In Euboeus of Paros, *Frag.* 1—

βάλλον δ' ἀλλήλους χαλκίρεσιν ἐγγείησιν—

a line verbally quoted from the *Iliad* in a humorous description of a fight in a barber's shop, Brandt says 'significantur forceipes quibus ut telis tonsores dimicabant: Schweighaeuserus olim proposuit ἀγγείουσιν quo omnis iocus tollitur.' Yes, but it would be a very small joke to call a pair of scissors a spear. Is there not a pun between ἐγγείη and ἐγγεῖν, the word here meaning the bronze ewer, or rather ladle (ἀρίταινα) used in washing?

Frag. Incert. 6 is interesting to all readers of the *Poetics* as restoring a complete line quoted there by Aristotle from the Arabic version of the *Poetics* recently edited by Prof. Margoliouth; the Greek MSS. of the *Poetics* having dropped the second half of the line. It should be noticed that Brandt includes in this volume the two half-lines also quoted in the *Poetics* (1457, b. 13) as instances

of metaphor, χαλκῷ ἀπὸ ψυχὴν ἀρύσας and τεμὼν [μιν] ἀτειρεὶ χαλκῷ. These do not sound like parodies, and there is no reason whatever for suspecting them to be other than serious metaphors.

Frag. Incert. 9 (the passage quoted by Galen on the natural inferiority of man regarded as a mere animal to other animals). Part of the passage is paraphrased in prose by Galen and two passages quoted in verse. In each case the quotation is introduced by φησὶν: and so in the second passage the verse should begin earlier than Brandt prints it—

αὐτὰρ ἐν ἱστορίῃ πολυπείρω
γράφει' ὅσος ὅτι παγκράτιον νίκησέ ποτ' ἄνδρας'
εἰκοστή κτλ.

The date of Matro's Ἀττικὸν δεῖπνον is fixed by Brandt within a few years of 300 B.C. It is written with great spirit and humour: nothing could be happier for instance than the mock-heroic descriptions of the cooks, ll. 11–13, 46, 47, and the description of the dessert, ll. 104–122, is the best and most vivid we possess. The guests wash their hands: a boy carries round perfume of iris-root, and another rose-garlands: the crater is filled with Lesbian wine: pears, apples, pomegranates and grapes are set on the table, with a large sweet cake: then two female jugglers come in to amuse the company.

The difficult l. 90

ἐν δὲ σίναπι
κεῖτ' ἀγχοῦ γλυκὲν πλείονα χρυσὸς ὢν ἀπερύκων
is still left a puzzle. Wachsmuth's conjecture,

Κεῖτ' ἀγχοῦ γλυκὲν πνέον, ἀτὰρ χέρας οὐκ
ἀπέρυκον,

is very clever but, as Brandt points out, the shortening of the final *v* in such a position is unexampled, and any satisfactory emendation must retain *χρυσός*. It seems a pity therefore to have placed the conjecture in

the text. In l. 122 (and again in *Frag. Incert.* 8 B) a word of protest must be put in against a tendency to find improper meanings in innocent passages.

The Ἠδονάθεια of Archestratus of Gela (*fl. circ.* 330 B.C.) is a work of a different class from Matro's. It is a didactic poem on eating, probably written rather seriously, and sometimes, as in the pretty description of autumn (*Fr.* xxxvi), going off into finewriting of the usual Alexandrian type. The editor points out that the numerous other names by which it is alluded to, Δειπνολογία, Γαστρονομία, Ὀψολογία, and *Hedysphagetica* in the Latin version of Ennius, arise from the true title being wider than the subject actually treated of. Athenaeus calls Archestratus 'the Hesiod of epicures,' and the work went under the name of 'Golden Words.' From the fragments now collected together, about 335 lines in all, one gets a pretty clear idea of Greek cookery. He is specially strong on sauces. Most of them are comparatively simple: cheese, oil, vinegar, wine, silphium, and minced pot-herbs are the list of ingredients; and there is a strong condemnation (*Fr.* lvii) of the rich sauces 'like glue' that make it impossible to tell a cat from a hare.

In *Fr.* xv. on the fish κάπρος—

ὅσοι μὴ πλεκτὸν ὕφασμα
σχοίνον ἐλειοτρόφου κοῖλον χεῖρεσσιν ἔχοντες
εἰώθασι δονεῖν ψήφους αἰθῶνι λογιμῷ
ἄρθρων μηλείων τ' ἐπ' ἄγρην δωρήματα βαλλειν—

I was glad to find by a note at the end of the volume that Wachsmuth would read *λογισμῷ*, a conjecture that had occurred to me.

This book will be very useful. But it must be added that it has the faults so common in modern German scholarship—a mass of erudition in the notes which has never been put properly into shape, and a Latin style in the introduction which has all the obscurity of German itself.

J. W. MACKAIL.

TEXTE UND UNTERSUCHUNGEN, IV. 1, V. 2, 3.

Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur. Band 4. Heft i. Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos recensuit EDUARDUS SCHWARTZ. 1888. 3 Mk. 60.

THIS edition of Tatian's *Oratio* is the first-fruits of a larger scheme proposed to themselves by Gebhardt and Schwartz in refer-

ence to the Greek Apologists. This volume contains the text, carefully constructed, with little or no reference to previous editions. The documentary evidence is of two kinds. (1) There are three principal MSS. (of which later MSS. are but copies), two of which were collated by Gebhardt as well as Schwartz. (2) There are quotations in the *Praeparatio*

and the *Historia* of Eusebius. Here praise-worthy care has been taken, Schwartz having examined for this edition six MSS. of the *Historia* and four of the *Praeparatio*. A subsidiary help is found in the study of Tatian's style. On this are based conjectural emendations which are not however inserted in the text. Schwartz holds that Tatian, a *malleus rhetorum*, was yet the slave of a rhetorical eccentricity in the avoidance at all costs of an hiatus. It is in his application of this opinion to the text that most exception will perhaps be taken to Schwartz' work. Thus to a sentence in the somewhat obscure but important passage in ch. v.—*καθὸ δὲ πᾶσα δύναμις ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων* [*αὐτὸς ὑπόστασις*] *ἦν σὺν αὐτῷ, τὰ πάντα σὺν αὐτῷ διὰ λογικῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ* [*καὶ ὁ λόγος, ὃς ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ*], *ὑπέστησεν*—Schwartz appends this note: '*αὐτὸς ὑπόστασις* ditto-graphiam censeo, *αὐτῷ ὑπέστησεν* hiatus intolerabilem praebet, καὶ ὁ λόγος—*αὐτῷ* ex seriore fide interpolata esse mihi probauit Wilamowitz.' A study of the context shows, if I mistake not, that *αὐτὸς* and *ὑπόστασις* are both required. As to the rejected words at the close of the sentence, they are read and commented on in the Scholium which bears the name of Arethas, and which, whoever its author, seems from its constant reference to Arianism to be of early date: they seem also postulated in what appears to be a reference of Tertullian to this passage (*adv. Prax.* v.), '*habebat enim secum quam habebat in semet ipso, rationem suam scilicet*.' An editor must be content with Tatian's style as he finds it. But some of the conjectures are happier, e.g. *ἀράχνας* for the pointless *ἀράπαις*, p. 4, l. 2.

A useful *Index Graecus* is added which gives, e.g. under *οικονομία*, a valuable collection of illustrative passages.

F. H. CHASE.

Ditto. Vol. V. Parts 2 and 3. Leipzig, 1888. (Part 2, 6 Mk.; Part 3, 4 Mk. 50.)

THE first of these two instalments contains a discussion of the dates of the various treatises of Tertullian by Professor Noeldechen, and also a small collection of new fragments attributed to Papias, Hegesippus, and Pierius, and derived from hitherto unknown citations from the Ecclesiastical History of Philippus Sidetes. The former is a very useful piece of work, although many of the conclusions are from the nature of the evidence only tentative. The latter, which is contributed by Dr. de Boor of Bonn, is some-

what startling. New fragments of Papias and Hegesippus are in themselves a surprise: and in some cases the contents of the fragments are also of considerable interest. It remains to be seen whether they will stand the criticism which no doubt they will before long receive.

These fragments come from a series of extracts in Codex Baroccianus 142. The compiler of the extracts names Eusebius as his source; but they contain portions which are not in our copies of Eusebius. Had the compiler a more complete copy, and have ours been seriously garbled? Or does the additional matter come from another source? Dr. de Boor decides for the latter alternative, and believes the source to be the voluminous *Χριστιανική ιστορία* of Philip of Side, of which only a few fragments remain. It ended with the year 428, and therefore was probably finished about that date. If this is correct, there is no improbability in the quotations being genuine quotations from the works of Papias and Hegesippus.

The fragment of the latter's work may be soon dismissed. It tells us that the names of the two sons of Jude, the brother of the Lord, who were brought before Domitian, were Zocer and James. It also states that Domitian abstained from further persecution, because he recognized the virtue of the men; which is much less probable than the Eusebian account, that he recognized their insignificance and treated them with contemptuous clemency.

The fragments which are given as from Papias are of more importance. They are to this effect. (1) Papias in his second book says that John the Divine and James his brother were murdered by Jews. (2) The above-mentioned Papias recorded on the authority of the daughters of Philip, that Barsabas surnamed Justus was put to the test by the unbelievers, and in drinking serpent's poison in the name of Christ was preserved unhurt. (3) And he records other marvels also, and especially the one about the mother of Manaim (? Manan), who rose from the dead. (4) Respecting those who were raised from the dead by Christ, that they lived to the time of Hadrian. Of these four, only the last is entirely new. In 1862 Nolte published the first, which he had found in the chronicle of Georgius Monachus. If Papias really made such a statement, he cannot have meant that the two brothers were slain at the same time, but that, just as Jews caused the death of James, so years afterwards they caused the death of John. To what this refers it is impossible to say.

The second of these instalments (Heft 3) contains a discussion of the endless puzzle respecting the Gospel according to the Hebrews. This contribution is by Rudolf Handmann. He first of all reviews the controversy on the subject from Lessing to the present day. Then he marshals the evidence supplied by the early Church from Clement of Alexandria to Bede and Nicéphorus. Thirdly he examines the extant fragments. And finally endeavours to arrive at some conclusions of his own. He admits that, when all is said and done, what we really know about the matter is little enough.

Everywhere the uncertain entity of the Hebrew original of S. Matthew's Gospel troubles the field of view, and the Gospel according to the Hebrews is its *Doppelgänger*. Herr Handmann inclines to the view that the fragments which have come down to us represent the Jewish stream of evangelical tradition much in the same way as the Gospel according to S. Mark represents the Gentile stream. For every one who wishes to study the question he has packed the main facts of the case into a pamphlet of 142 pages.

A. PLUMMER.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE ROMAN PROVINCES.

Forschungen zur Verwaltungsgeschichte des Römischen Kaiserreichs. Von W. LIEBENAM. I. Band. Die Legaten in der Römischen Provinzen von Augustus bis Diocletian. Leipzig. Pp. 482. 12 Mk.

THIS volume contains a good deal of unobtrusive but very thorough and useful work, being in fact the first instalment of the complete *Fasti* of all the more important provincial officials throughout the empire. The present volume contains the imperial legati. The next will comprise the proconsuls of the senatorial provinces. Then will follow the other subordinate officials employed in the provincial administration with a discussion on the senatorial 'cursus honorum,' while the two last volumes will contain an account of the bureaucracy resulting from the changes introduced by Diocletian and Constantine, as well as the provincial *Fasti* up to the reign of Justinian. The author is no doubt right in asserting that a collection of this kind will be of value not only for understanding the development and system of the Roman administration, but also for the actual history of the period, since in becoming acquainted with the men to whom the provincial government was entrusted we are introduced to the personages who played the most important part under the emperors in the imperial history. Indeed, whatever opinion we may hold as to the character of the Roman rule, the careers of many of these nobles compel us to admit that, as far as an almost life-long training and experience in the diverse conditions of the various provinces could produce a capacity for administration and an appreciation of the problems which needed solution, many a

governor like Domitius Corbulo, or Suetonius Paulinus, or C. Sentius Saturninus had the qualifications which would apparently ensure success. For some of the provinces we already possess *Fasti* more or less complete, e.g. those of Waddington for Asia Minor, of Perrot for Galatia, of Tissot for Africa; but the advantage of having all the governors, as complete as the materials will admit, are obvious, and it is to be hoped that Dr. Liebenam will bring his elaborate scheme to a successful completion. The *Fasti* in the present volume are arranged according to provinces, placed alphabetically, a brief notice based on Marquardt's *Staatsverwaltung* as to the acquisition and circumstances of each province being prefixed, while the legati of the province are arranged as far as possible chronologically. Under the head of each are given any inscriptions which relate to him, and any passages from classical texts which throw light on his career. With this part of the work there is no fault to be found, nor in working through several of the provinces have I detected any inaccuracy. The alphabetical arrangement of the provinces however results in certain inconveniences, because the career of each legatus comes under that province which is alphabetically the first among those with which he was connected, irrespective of its place in his 'cursus honorum.' Thus the career of Suetonius Paulinus comes under Africa rather than Britain; that of Mucianus under Lycia rather than Syria; that of Lollius Urbicus under Asia rather than Lower Germany. No doubt the index of names at the end to a certain extent remedies this confusion, but it would surely have been preferable to put the more important pro-

vinces first, and then the minor ones, perhaps in alphabetical order. But a more serious flaw is the inclusion in the present volume of those legati who were not provincial governors at all, but merely legates of the proconsuls in the senatorial provinces. The difference between these two classes of legati is of course not ignored by Dr. Liebenam, who indeed explains it clearly enough in the exposition at the end of the book, but none the less their coordination here with the more important legati is a serious error of judgment. It would have been far better to have omitted altogether the senatorial provinces, reserving them for the list of proconsuls in the second volume, and inserting the subordinate legati among the other officials in the third volume. The circumstances of Africa in regard to the legati were peculiar. Here, in addition to the three legati pro praetore who acted as assistants to the proconsul, there was since the time of Caligula a legatus pro praetore exercitus Africae, whose power was really coordinate with that of the proconsul, though exercised only in that part of the province which needed a military garrison. This officer subsequently, but not till Septimius Severus, became the legatus Numidia. Dr. Liebenam however has inaccurately placed all these legati, even in the first two centuries, under the head of Numidia, though this was not at the time a separate province, nor coextensive with the command of the legati. Besides, such titles as 'legatus Africae' applied to Cn. Domitius Afer (Wilm. 1148), 'legatus pr. prov. Africae' to Caesernius Statius (Wilm. 1184), and many others (conf. Wilm. 1147 and 1149) clearly prove this to be wrong. Suetonius Paulinus and Clodius Macer who were legati of the same kind are correctly, though inconsistently, put under Africa. However, considering the diversity of the material, the inaccuracies in the book are very few, and Dr. Liebenam deserves the hearty thanks of all students of Roman history for the care which he has expended on this useful work.

E. G. HARDY.

Les Assemblées Provinciales dans l'Empire Romain: par PAUL GIRAUD. Paris. Thorin. 10 francs.

This is the most complete and elaborate attempt which has yet been made to sum up and classify all that is known of the Provincial Assemblies from classical texts, inscriptions, coins, and references in the

Digest. Hitherto what most students know of this institution is gained from the brief but admirable resumé of the subject in Marquardt's *Staatsverwaltung*, which however should certainly be studied side by side with the same author's summing up of the available epigraphical material in vol. i. of the *Ephemeris Epigraphica*. For the province of Asia the monograph by Monceaux (reviewed in our last number) enters with some detail into the peculiarities of the institution in that province, while Pallu de Lessert has collected the very meagre material for the concilia in the African provinces in a monograph on 'L'assemblée provinciale dans l'Afrique romaine,' a title by the way which raises much more expectation than the book satisfies. We should naturally have expected to find the subject treated with some thoroughness in Mommsen's volume on the Provinces of the Roman Empire. In this however we are disappointed, since the references made to the concilium of the three Gauls and to the *κοῖνον* of Asia are strikingly scanty and insufficient. Mons. Giraud has to a large extent supplied what has hitherto been a conspicuous gap in our knowledge of provincial institutions, and probably all the information which the materials, almost entirely epigraphical, place at our disposal, covering as it does nearly all the provinces, is here collected and judiciously arranged. The historical development of the institution, except as regards its creation by Augustus, and the greater diffusion and stricter regulation of its activity in post-Diocletian times, is beyond the range of our material, but Mons. Giraud follows Boissier, though with a much larger citation of authorities, in tracing back the Augustan cult, round which the assemblies centred, to its antecedents both in Roman religion itself, and in foreign and especially oriental influences, while he attempts, and in many cases successfully, to fix the earliest and the latest mention of the assemblies in particular provinces. Mons. Giraud is no doubt right in holding that the assemblies were not intended to be directly political, and still less were an attempt at any system of representation for the empire. Originating in the Augustan cult, they were judiciously made by Augustus the means of establishing a kind of state religion in which all provinces could join, while the extravagances natural to the cult of a living person were obviated by idealising the object of the worship, and for the living emperor substituting 'Rome and the Augustus,' a substitution which implies, as Desjardins well puts it, not so much a man apotheosised as

the state symbolised. On the organisation of the assemblies, the actual cult and the games connected with the periodical meetings, all possible light is thrown furnished by inscriptions and coins. No doubt Mons. Giraud is right, in spite of certain inscriptions which raise some difficulty, in discarding the view of quinquennial meetings, and still more certainly is he right in rejecting Hübner's view that each civitas in the province elected its own sacerdos, these representatives forming a kind of collegium of priests at the provincial place of assembly. Inscriptions prove that each province had one sacerdos, elected by the concilium and for a single year. The identity or non-identity of the ἀρχιεὺς τῆς Ἀσίας and the Ἀσιάρχης has furnished material for considerable discussion, on which Mommsen in a lengthy note on the subject (p. 320) throws no fresh light. Mons. Giraud contents himself with restating Marquardt's arguments for their identity, which, if not actually conclusive, at least make his view the more probable, while a very ingenious and at first sight plausible theory of Monceaux on the subject is completely disposed of. Monceaux had supposed that just as the duumviri in municipal towns were every fifth year entitled quinquennales, so the ἀρχιεὺς τῆς Ἀσίας were each fifth year, in which the great games were held, called Ἀσιάρχαι; in other words while all Asiarchs were ἀρχιεὺς, not all ἀρχιεὺς were Asiarchs. Unfortunately however we know of twenty-six Asiarchs between Septimius Severus and Gallienus, i.e. in sixty-seven years, whereas if Asiarchs were quinquennial only, one hundred and four years would be required to account for twenty-six of them. Into the complications introduced into the institution in Asia by the existence of provincial temples in all the principal cities, and the consequent multiplication of ἀρχιεὺς, Mons. Giraud does not direct any special investigation, nor can the results arrived at by Monceaux be regarded as either final or satisfactory, while the view that the κοῖνον τῆς Ἀσίας was held alternately in the principal cities is hardly consistent with an inference which Giraud himself draws from

coins, that it was held in Pergamum in two consecutive years, 97 and 98 A.D. One matter of detail is however, I think, here finally settled. The inquisitor Galliarum mentioned in several inscriptions has generally been taken to be a treasury official of some kind. A reference however to Pliny (*Ep.* III. 9, 29 and 31) proves that the inquisitor was appointed to collect evidence in case of a provincial prosecution. On these prosecutions there is an interesting and exhaustive chapter, though it is not quite clear whether Mons. Giraud holds with Mommsen and Marquadt that these prosecutions were one of the main objects with Augustus in establishing the assemblies, or whether they were rather a subsequent development. The latter view it seems to me is the more probable, and it is rendered all the more so by Mons. Giraud's view of the legal position of the assemblies. They were in his opinion on the same level in the eyes of the law, though on a larger scale and with a more uniform organisation, with the various collegia, the nature and objects of which are so multifarious and, we may add, so little explored. If this view is correct, much is explained which otherwise appears remarkable; e.g. the rarity of references to the Provincial Assemblies in classical authors, the absence of all proof that they ever attempted to interfere in revolutionary movement in the provinces, and the extremely heterogeneous nature of the matters on which the emperors communicated with the provincials by their means. However on this subject I can only refer to Mons. Giraud's treatment. Possibly he is in this, as in some other points, inclined to be more constructive than the materials warrant, but there is at least this to be said that, if readers of the book are misled, the responsibility rests with themselves, as the wealth of citations and references, in which the great value of the book lies, will, if examined, show exactly where the author is justified in his statements, and where he is indulging in—what is perfectly legitimate, though it should be carefully checked—the historical imagination.

E. G. HARDY.

THE VOCALIC LAWS OF THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

The Vocalic Laws of the Latin Language. By
E. R. WHARTON, M.A.

THIS interesting paper was read at the meeting of the Philological Society held on June 1st, 1888. The author has collected a large number of facts, some of them necessarily very familiar, and has suggested a considerable number of new derivations, all of which are ingenious, and some of which are convincing. The only important generalisation that he offers which is not already well known to students of philological literature is one with which his name is already connected—that by which an originally pretonic *e* or *o* becomes *a*. The theory is at least eminently plausible, enabling us as it does to get over the difficulties that have long attended the identification of *vas* (*vadis*) and *ἄθλον*, *magnās* and *μέγας*, *maneo* and *μένω*, *salvās* and *solidus*. In other cases Mr. Wharton has not done much more than collect the facts; in the case, for instance, of the variation between *i* and *e*, and *o* and *a* in root syllables, it may be true that we have the influence of contending dialects, but if nothing more definite than this can be said, we may well despair of ever arriving at any scientific statement of the laws of Latin vocalism. Some of Mr. Wharton's etymologies do not carry conviction—such as the connection of *taurus* and *obturo* ('to put a dead weight on'—compare, it would seem, βούς ἐπὶ γλώσσῃ), or the suggestion that the diphthong in *Aesculapius* as compared with Ἄσκληπιός is due to the god of healing having always suggested to the Latin mind the physician's fee (*aes*). Why the *u* of *euntis*

should be due to dissimilation and this form alone have suggested the whole series of gerundives of the type *dicundi* is not clear. It is more satisfactory to suppose that both *euntis* and the gerunds in *-undo-* represent the strong form of the participial suffix *-ont-*, which is all but universal in Greek. And though the derivation of the much disputed *sirempse* is undeniably ingenious, it might be well if Mr. Wharton would produce any other instance of a perfect infinitive passing into a substantive; for the hypothesis is not sufficiently supported by Wölfflin's very risky *instar(e)*.

It is not without a considerable feeling of discouragement that we lay down this paper. If Mr. Wharton, with his intimate acquaintance with the science and with all the ingenuity that was abundantly shown in his *Etyma Graeca*, and which makes his promised *Etyma Latina* so eagerly expected, can yet contribute so little towards putting the laws of Latin on a sound scientific basis, we may well ask where the solution is to come from. It is evidently not the workmen that are at fault, but the tools that are deficient. All that can be done with the known laws of language has been done admirably. But plainly some new departure is required, and until by some stroke of luck or genius a theory is hit on which shall do for Latin what Verner's law, for example, did for the German languages, we must be content to glean some new but isolated fact here and there, and for all practical purposes the science must remain at a standstill.

CHR. COOKSON.

LATIN AND GREEK ETYMOLOGY.

La Lingua Graeca Antica. By PROF. PEZZI.
Turin. 1888. 12 lire.

THE student of Greek etymology, whatever his nationality, cannot complain that his requirements have been neglected since Brugmann in 1876 revolutionised the science by his discovery of the vocalic laws of the Aryan languages. The first fruit of the discovery was Gustav Meyer's *Greek Grammar* (1880: a second edition in 1886), which for combination of thoroughness and judg-

ment has not yet been surpassed. Then came Brugmann's masterly abstract of the subject in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* (1885): in 1887 (the date on the title-page is prospective) appeared the work now under review, and in 1888 Victor Henry's inimitable *Précis de Grammaire Comparée du Grec et du Latin*, and Messrs. King and Cookson's *Principles of Sound and Inflection as illustrated in the Greek and Latin Languages*.

Prof. Pezzi is known to the English

reader through his *Glottologia Aria Recentissima* (1877), translated as *Aryan Philology according to the Most Recent Researches* (1879). In that work he gave a clear and useful account of Greek etymology as it stood up to 1876, the chief advance which he describes being Ascoli's discovery of the 'velar' gutturals (1870); but Brugmann's brilliant discoveries of 1876 had not reached him, he has no notion of 'sonant' liquids, or Ablaut-series, or of any pure vowel but *a*. The *Glottologia* appeared a year too early, and now seems to us quite old-fashioned.

The *Lingua Graeca Antiqua* however is of quite another stamp, and up to the latest views: no writer on the subject, whether German, French or English, seems to have escaped the author's notice (e.g. on p. 426 he quotes the *Transactions of the Oxford Philological Society*). The work falls into three distinct divisions: Preliminary in 80 pages, Part I. (*Panellenismo Glottico*) in 228, and Part II. (*Dialetti Ellenici*) in 166. The first of these divisions is a succinct and thoughtful account of the history of Greek philology from the first Greek grammarians and lexicographers down to the latest productions of Germany. The latter part of this introduction is agreeably free from all trace of partisanship or unfairness: each work is judiciously characterised without reference to the personality of its author.

It is in the second division of his work—which embraces the sounds, inflexions and syntax of the language—that Prof. Pezzi becomes subject to comparison with other workers in the same field. In his method he combines Victor Henry's arrangement with Gustav Meyer's: the text is a brief account of Greek etymology, morphology and construction, while in the notes, which take up about two-thirds of the whole space, he gives authorities, details and discussions of points at issue. Henry's plan, of giving at the beginning of his work a list of authorities and then dispensing in the text with special references, possesses certain advantages over Prof. Pezzi's, and for the learner is much more convenient: but in fulness and thoroughness Prof. Pezzi has no rival except Gustav Meyer. It is to be regretted that he evades, on the pretext of want of space, any explanation of the origin of $\pi\tau$, $\chi\theta$ and $\phi\theta$ (p. 124): the subject is so obscure, and so unsatisfactorily treated by our German authorities, that any fresh light on it would have been welcomed.

But the distinctive portion of the work is Part II., on the Greek dialects: their

general characteristics are given in the text, their peculiarities in elaborate notes, with information brought up to date by the help of Collitz's *Sammlung der Griechischen Dialektinschriften* as far as it has gone. This part would seem especially worthy of a translation: no recent writer has treated the subject more freshly or instructively. In Greek, despite all the attention which has been spent on it since it supplanted Sanskrit as the language best worth studying for the etymologist, plenty yet remains to be done; and it is only by a wide knowledge of the Greek dialects that any success can be hoped for.

The printing of the book is admirable, the beauty of the Greek type especially noticeable. On p. 59, note, the name of the Dean of Christchurch is wrongly spelt.

E. R. WHARTON.

Victor Henry's *Précis de Grammaire Comparée du Grec et du Latin* (2nd edition, Paris, 1889). 8 francs.

No better introduction to classical etymology than this has yet appeared. Prof. Henry has the advantage of writing in a language of such unrivalled lucidity that in it the most abstruse subjects seem plain and simple; and he is himself a master in whose hands we may feel safe, who is conversant with the latest philological literature and can take a connected view of his science. The book is one which may be read with pleasure as well as profit. The introductory list of authorities is extremely valuable, and saves the need of detailed references: Prof. Henry does not care to do as the Germans do and give his work the appearance of a bookseller's catalogue. Only those who have worked in the same field will understand the severe self-repression which he exhibits. His account of the Indo-European languages is a model of brevity and clearness. His main subject he divides, as Brugmann does, into the three heads of Phonetic, Etymology (*i.e.* the analysis of terminations: a somewhat arbitrary restriction of the use of the term), and Morphology or flexion (which, as he says, might also, but less conveniently, be put under the second head). The whole work is divided into 300 sections, to the numbers of which we shall refer below.

The book is especially valuable as a protest against that revival of the old 'Agglutination-theory' with which the Germans threaten us: the explanation of *e.g.* *herbidus*

as 'giving grass' is marked as 'peu vraisemblable' (163), 'we need not explain when we can only state' (182, p. 189), suffixes may have become words (e.g. the French term *ana*) instead of conversely (183, p. 190). All doubtful points, e.g. the formation of *vehier*, are marked as such, and the limits of our present knowledge recognised without hesitation: a caution sometimes carried to excess, e.g. Wackernagel's explanation of ὁράαν (72, p. 83) might well have been given, as well as Bezzenberger's of the termination *-inquus* (162, p. 167) as = -αρός, with Bréal's derivation of *splendeō* (64, p. 74, note) from σπλήν. The system of using 'formulae' or equations, e.g. '*legeris* = *legere* = *legis* = *lege*,' is much to be recommended. The book is indeed so good that minute criticism of details is justifiable.

The following connexions are either doubtful or impossible: 33 *filius* θῆσθαι, 36 *ango* (in which, 58, the consonant is a palatal) *anguis*, 41 (p. 51) αἶθω *aestus* (which should then be **aesus*), 51 ἀλείφω λίτρα (the two should go with *delibūtus* and *lippus* respectively), 57 (p. 65) βόλλεται volo, 60 τιθαβώσω *faber* (with a 'peut-être'), 63 *agnus* (in which the *a* is long by nature, not by mere position) ἀμνός (which should then be **ἡμνός*), 68 fin. fallo σφάλλω, 114 *almus* 'tutelary' (which Bücheler puts with Umbrian *arsmor* 'ceremonies': it then = **admus*) αλο, 117 βρέμω (why not **φρέμω*?) fremo, 120 nox (with a 'velar') necō, miles mille, satelles sata, 126 minor μείων, 179 (p. 181, note) *sincerus* creō (rather -erus is the termination, cf. *severus*, and **sin-cus* goes with *sem-el*) (p. 183), *parricida* *patricida*, 210 (p. 236), *omnēs* *hominēs* (from Bréal). The following comparisons are inexact: 39 ὅρα *jahr* (the vowel is different), 141 fin. *cōmissor* (really from **κομίζω*, a by-form) *κομάζω*. In the analysis of terminations the following points may be noticed: 105 **fuō* would give **buō* not *-bō*; 147 **ama-ē-bam* would give **amaebam* not *amābam*, **audi-ē-bam* would remain (cf. *pietas*), and so 148 **amaeram*; 158 (p. 164), the word may be divided as *tacit-urnus*; 161 the termination of *χερείων* cannot be deduced from -ios; 166, 167 -φόρ- and -φέω could hardly lose their *F* after a consonant; 169 'sigmatic insertion' hardly explains ἑπα-σ-της; 179 *magnificus* beside *auru-fex* points to a 'modified' *u* in the second syllable, and (p. 182) *tibicen* must = **tibii-cen* not **tibie-cen*; 187 (p. 195), *bene male* are Locatives (final -i becoming -ē), cf. *benignus* *malignus*; 193 (p. 209), **escā-es* would give **escaes* (cf. ὄλος from **ōlōis*) not *escāes*; 213 (p. 241), *nāvis* hardly owes its *i*

to the Dative, in *brevis levis pānis* the *i* is equally unoriginal; 221 (p. 254), note, *tam* cannot be Acc. Fem. of *to-*, as the old form was *tame* (Festus); 225 (p. 259), *sed* was originally *sedum* (Charisius); 279 (p. 307), *dominus* cannot be a Participle Middle, for the old form was *dubennus* (Festus). Correction seems required also in the following instances: 30 *furo nurus* show that *fore* cannot = **fu-re*; 62 fin. (and 93 fin.) Thurneysen's theory that *pango* = **pac-no* is not 'sans doute,' for *dignus* does not become **dingus*; 79 the *ā-* of *ἀνεμῖός* may be copulative, as is the *ō-* of *ὀδοῦς* 123 (the root is not *ōδ-*): 90 fin. **τίττω*, despite Brugmann, would give **τίσσω* not *τίκτω*; 122, note, *Saeturnus* may be a mere mis-spelling; 148 fin. the authority for *mōrat* and *vōrat* should be given; 180 that *φερέουκος* came from *φέρε οἶκον* ('interjection adressée à la tortue') is too much to believe; 200 (p. 217, note), *sal* for **sal-s* is not quite paralleled by *puls* for **pult-s*; 202, note, the long vowel in *lēx rēx* &c. can hardly be properly peculiar to the Nominative, the explanation will not fit forms like *tēgula*; 242 *pēgi* exists as well as *compegi*; 245 (p. 278), the Aorists *ἔδων ἔθην* are not used in the Singular, they should be given as *ἔδομεν ἔθεμεν*; 251 (p. 286), *tremonti* is not 'quoted by Festus from a Salian hymn,' he has only 'pretet tremonti praetement pe,' while Terentius Scaurus cites from a Salian hymn of Numa's 'cuine ponas Leucesiae praetexere monti,' and out of the two Bergk manufactures 'cume tonas, Leucesie, prae tet tremonti,' which is pretty but bold; 279 *ōn* is no contraction of *ῶν*, but from the short form *σ-* instead of the full form *ῥσ-*. The following forms are post-classical: 146 ἐλελύκειν for ἐλελύκη, 177 νυχθήμερον and μυροπισσόκηρος (better examples of 'copulative' compounds would be ἑνδεκα δώδεκα &c.), 240 (p. 274), ὁμόσω for ὁμοῦμαι.

Prof. Henry seldom omits anything of importance, though in 26 (p. 32), he should have given *cheru heru heus* as examples of the diphthong *eu*, and in 68 (p. 76), added Sanskrit *tyaj* to the derivation of *σέβομαι* which he adopts from Brugmann; and we should have liked in 49 fin. and 52 some instances of long sonants (in 90, note, he gives *βλητός θνήσσω*), in 57 and 210 fin. an attempt to explain forms like *πρόλις χθών*, and in 113 an account of the relation of *κυν-ός* to *κύνω*.

Misprints are hard to find. The quantity of the long vowel should be marked in 79 (p. 93), *stipendrium* (where *stip-* comes from **stipp-*, as *amentum* from *ammentum*), 179 (p. 182), *ūpiliō* (which *n* Vergil must be a

trisyllable), 272 (note) *sīmus*. In 115 fin. (p. 131), *-mono* should be *-monā*; 206 (p. 229), *hominibus pedibus* are put in the wrong order; 151 fin. *παῖδ' ὅν* and 196 *ἰππότα* are wrongly accented, 167 fin. *τῆμ' ἄν* and 241 fin. *tetuli* wrongly marked as non-existent. In 298 fin. 'Théocr. Syracus. 58' might be put more simply as 'Théocr. 15, 58.' The table of contents comes at the end of the book, as often in French writers: it is surely more convenient to place it at the beginning.

The first edition of the work appeared last

year. In the second edition few changes have been made: the most important of them the more detailed account of the history of *vs* (47), a reference to the theory (on which see Thurneysen in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, xxx. p. 494 sq.) that *e.g. dandi* = **damenay* (115 fin., note), and some remarks on the genesis of forms like *jugā* (190 fin.). The new derivation of *bubuleus* from *fulciō* (179, p. 182) is not attractive.

E. R. WHARTON.

Ovid. Amores, Epistulae, Medicamina faciei femineae, Ars amatoria, Remedia amoris, ex Rudolphi Merkelii recognitione edidit R. EHWARD. Lips. 1888. (Being Vol. I. of the Teubner text of Ovid.) 1 Mk.

DR. EHWARD'S revision of the first volume of the Teubner text of Ovid has been executed with that caution and care for which he has long been known to Ovid students by his exhaustive reviews in Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, as well as by his text of the *Tristia*. The MS. material used is with slight exceptions the same as that of Merkel, the chief additional matter employed by the editor being the works of Palmer, Sedlmayer and Vahlen on the *Heroides*, De Vries on the *Epistula Sapphus*, Kunz on the *Medicamina formae* (not *faciei* surely, a form of the genitive which Ovid would not have used: cf. *A. A.* III. 205), and an Oxford MS. published by Ellis for Book I. of the *Ars Amatoria*. I cannot but regret that the apparatus criticus is printed in a continuous and most inconvenient form as a preface, instead of (as in Baehrens' Teubner texts) at the foot of the page. What reader, especially of poetry, and most of all of such poetry as the *Ars Amatoria*, can be expected to pause in his reading and research among the closely printed remarks of a critical preface of forty-one pages? Also, would not Dr. Ehwald have done more wisely if he had given the readings throughout of the one or two best MSS. in all important passages, and less of the emendations and suspicions as to the genuineness of particular lines of scholars ancient and modern? Apart from these slight defects it must be admitted that this text is far superior to any that has yet appeared of this part of Ovid, and the editor deserves our warmest thanks. He has frequently restored a MS. reading unnecessarily deserted by Merkel (e.g. *Am. I. viii. 11 stillantia for stellantia*); his own conjectures, which are few, are always clever and often convincing, e.g. *Am. I. xiii. 19 atque uades sponsum stultos ante Atria mittis: Ep. Sapph. 63 sparsit opes frater meretricis captus amore*. I mention a few points in which I cannot agree: *Am. I. ix. 5 quos petiere duces annos in milite forti, | hos petit in socio bella puella uiro: for annos Ehwald accepts animos*, a conjecture of Rautenberg, which destroys the point of the couplet: Ovid meant that a lover must be a *iuuenis*, as he says in the preceding line *turpe senex miles, turpe senilis amor. H. VII. 45*. Ehwald reads from his own conjecture *non ego sum tanti (quidni cuncteris, inique ?) for quid non uerearis*. I propose *quid me uerearis, inique ?* which seems to me to be supported by *me fugis* in the next line. *H. IX. 126*, marked as corrupt by Ehwald, might, I think, be read after the MS. *P. fortunam uultu*

fassa tegente suam, and explained 'confessing her fortune with looks that belie it.' *H. XII. 17* Ehwald reads *semina icissset, totidemque et semina et hostes*, where *-que*, though possible, is awkward. I propose *semina icissset totidem, quot seuerat, hostes*. In conclusion I could wish that the Paris MSS. had been collated anew for this edition, for there are serious discrepancies between the collations of Keil, used by Ehwald, and those of Sedlmayer.

S. G. OWEN.

Ad historiam carminum Ovidianorum recensio-nemque symbolae. Scripsit R. EHWARD. Gotha. 1889. 1 Mk.

EHWARD, the cooperator of Merkel in the Teubner 1884 edition of Ovid's *Fasti Tristia Pontic Epistles* and *Ibis*, and since Merkel's decease the re-editor in 1888 of the *Amores* and other works contained in the first volume of this edition (the *Metamorphoses* edited by Merkel himself appeared in 1881), has in a short treatise of twenty pages collected a great number of facts bearing on the study of the *Tristia* after Ovid's death, not only in writers who might still be called Roman, but through the Middle Age on to the time of Petrarch and Mussato in the 14th century. Those who know the care with which Ehwald has edited the *Tristia*, or who have read his minute and thorough examination of the literature on Ovid which has appeared within the last ten years in Bursian's, now Iwan Müller's, *Berichte über die fortschritte der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft*, will not be disappointed to find in this little work (he calls it himself a *Commentariolum*) an amount of information primarily on the *Tristia*, incidentally on many other points connected with Ovid, which might recommend it not merely for skimming in a public library, but for repeated and serious reference. In few words, it will more than repay the shilling which it costs. Among other points in which Ehwald here deserves careful study is his citation, in the most exact way, of some readings of the most valuable MSS. of Ovid. Thus the now famous Marcianus (of which Mr. S. G. Owen has given a collation, so far as it goes, in his edition of the first book) is more than once brought before us: similarly the Guelferbytanus, and that splendid specimen of later 12th century calligraphy, the Turonensis 879, of such infinite value for the text of the *Ibis*.

On p. 3 a suggestion of new Ovidian fragments is offered, which deserves the attention of the next editor of a complete Ovid.

In his general summary, p. 4, Ehwald says the *Tristia* are rarely cited by the Grammarians; never

by Nonius, Macrobius, Isidorus, or even by those prose writers who admired the poet and sometimes quote his other works, e.g. the two Senecas. They are however not unfrequently worked into the diction of subsequent poets (this part of the subject is fully treated by Zingerle) and even into inscriptions, p. 8. Thus in a *titulus* which records the completion of a monument by one L. Valerius Aries, freedman of a certain slave-merchant called Zabda, the two vv. *Trist.* i. 11. 11, 12 are thus quoted

SEV. STVFOR. EST. HVIC. STVDIO. SIVE EST.
INSANIA. NOMEN
OMNIS. AB. HAC. CVRA. CVRA. LEVATA. MEA. EST

where the MSS. of Ovid give

Seu stupor huic studio sive est insania nomen,
Omnis ab hac cura mens releuata mea est.

I see that Ehwald accepts as right in a passage of the *Metamorphoses* (viii. 237)

Garrula ramosa prospexit ab ilice perdis

the new reading which Keil found in a grammatical treatise, *limoso elice* (Gramm. Lat. V. p. 587). Naturalists I suppose would agree in thinking it more likely that a partridge would be seated on a muddy field-drain than a many-branched ilex: yet in spite of Madvig's support (*Advers. Crit.* II. p. 81) a doubt still lingers in my mind in favour of the common reading, in which I believe all known codices of the *Metamorphoses* agree.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii de Bello Civili,
ed. GUIL. THEOD. PAUL. Vindobonae et Pragae.
1889. (Editio maior). 90 Pf.

THIS is a new volume of the *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum*, of which C. Schenkl is the general editor. It consists of a revised text of the *B.C.* with a critical preface of over 50 pages in which the editor records the most important variations of the MSS., the chief alterations proposed by other scholars and a number of new readings of his own, many of which are introduced into the text. Those who have compared in the *B.G.* the readings of the second class of MSS. with those of the first class will readily understand what scope there is for emendation in a text which has to rest on the former class alone, and will hesitate to charge Herr Paul with undue rashness. The chief MSS. available for the *B.C.* are Ursinianus (*h*) and Riccardianus or Florentinus (*l*), of the xith cent., and Thuanensis (*a*) and Vindobonensis I (*f*), of the xiiith cent. The readings of the first two are preferred where they differ from those of the others. The editor's emendations, so far as I have observed them, generally improve the sense though they sometimes depart rather widely from the original. I add some remarks on a few passages. In i. 1 §2 Paul brackets the words *in civitate* with most editors, without explaining their origin. I suggest that they were originally a late marginal gloss meaning 'in the city' for the more correct *in urbe*; an equally barbarous hand may have written *latitatis* as an explanation of *invisis* 'unseen' in iii. 4 §4. i. 3 §1 he inserts *audaces* after *laudat*, thus making the sentence contain two words, *audax* and *segnis*, not elsewhere used by Caesar; *promptos*, proposed by Pantagathus, is more likely to have dropped out before *Pompeius*, or one might suggest *alacres* before *atque*. i. 5 §1 he writes *sobrita sceleratorum audacia* and introduces the same word *sceleratorum* in iii. 109 §6 for *et latronum*, where perhaps no change is required. i. 11 §2 for

peracto consulatu Caesaris he has *parto consulatu Caesaris*, which is distinctly not Caesarian Latin. In i. 25 §6 he does not notice Col. Stoffel's explanation (*Histoire*, i. 250). In i. 40 §7 *ab equitibus* is altered on insufficient grounds to *ancipiti*. In ii. 23 §1 for *biduoque et noctibus tribus navigatione consumptis* he accepts Ciacconius' *biduoque et nocte in navigatione consumpta*, probably rightly as regards the preposition, but the very form of the phrase indicates that a longer time than usual was spent on the transit. In iii. 46 §6 I do not share his objection to *omnino*. In iii. 71 §3 he makes nonsense of the passage by altering *hoc nomen obtinuit* to *hoc nomine abstinuit*. Enough has been said to show that Herr Paul's changes in the text must not be accepted without careful examination: at the same time the book is one that no future editor can neglect as it contains many useful criticisms and some highly probable corrections. The type is admirably clear, and readers of Nipperdey and Dinter (1875), who often spell a word in different ways on the same page, will appreciate the uniformity of the orthography. Herr Paul indulges in the curious declension nom. *Madvig*, gen. *Madvici*. A. G. PESKETT.

Livius XXI-XXIII. mit Verweisungen auf
Caesars bellum Gallicum für die Bedürfnisse der
Schule grammatisch untersucht von Dr. FRANZ
FÜGNER. Berlin 1888. pp. 160.

DR. FÜGNER is an ardent admirer of Livy. In the *Jahrbücher für Philologie* for 1886 he earnestly advocated that in the *Ober-Secunda* of the gymnasia Livy, and preferably his third decade, should occupy as definite and fixed a place as is that held by Caesar in the *Tertia*. This work is undertaken, as the preface declares, with the purpose 'of making the language as well as the syntax of Livy better known, and of bringing him into higher honour among the schools than he now enjoys,' and also of 'gaining new friends for Livy in the schools and of lightening the labours of old friends.' With this in view the editor has made a careful and statistical study of these three books of Livy, giving a comparison of the usages of Livy and of Caesar. Beginning with the arrangement of the sentence, as a whole and in parts, he proceeds to examine the cases in their different uses. The number of the different uses is given and, except in the more common ones, the places of occurrence are given. The prepositions are then taken in order, and these are followed by an examination of the use of tenses and moods. The infinitive, which is happily treated not as a dependent clause but as a noun, has a very full consideration, with a careful analysis of the more than 1200 instances in these books.

The examination of the gerund and the gerundive shows that Livy did not conform to the principle laid down in the grammars in treating of the instrumental and modal ablative, that the gerundive is generally used instead of a gerund with an object. Over against 22 instances of the gerundive stand 27 instances of the gerund with an object. In comparison with Caesar, Livy favours the ablative, for he has 97 cases to Caesar's 25, and he uses the ablative without a preposition 76 times to Caesar's 4 times. On the other hand Caesar employs the genitive with *causa* or *gratia* 53 times to Livy's 13 times.

The comparison of dependent clauses shows an interesting difference between Livy and Caesar in the use of the subjunctive, the latter inclining much more to its use. For instance, Livy employs *cum* historic with the subjunctive 194 times, Caesar 245 times. *Postquam*, *ubi*, *ut* &c. = 'as soon as,' are used

with the indicative by Livy 135 times, by Caesar 51 times. Similarly Livy favours the indicative with *dum*, *donec*, and *quoad*. In causal clauses with *quod* and *quia* it is noticeable how completely Livy substitutes *quia* for Caesar's *quod*. He uses *quia* with the indicative 71 times, while there is no instance in Caesar, but he employs *quod* only 17 times to Caesar's 136 times. With the subjunctive the cases are 24 to 48. Caesar's use of the subjunctive is doubtless partly due to his writing in the third person.

The very convenient statement here contained of Livy's general usage in these three books will be of great use to the teacher in settling many questions of construction. The hope is reasonable which the author expresses in his conclusion, that for the beginner and for the teacher who has not the inclination or opportunity to make special investigations his book may to a great extent supply the place of Kühnast's cumbersome work.

JOHN K. LORD.

Dartmouth College.

Hanover, New Hampshire.

Die Lakonika des Pausanias auf ihre Quellen untersucht. By WALTER IMMERWAHR. Berlin: Mayer and Müller. 1889. 3 Mk.

THE author's object in writing this monograph, he tells us in his Preface, is to subject a portion of Pausanias' work to a close scrutiny, in order to determine as far as possible the source from which each particular statement which it contains is derived. In doing this he is following in the wake of Kalkmann, whose able work, *Pausanias der Perieget*, was noticed in the first volume of the *Classical Review* (p. 102). Whatever may be thought of Kalkmann's general conclusions in that book with regard to the honesty and trustworthiness of the ancient topographer—and these, as far as we have had the opportunity of observing, have met with only a qualified acceptance—yet he has succeeded in pointing out the leading authorities whom Pausanias consulted. The reasons which have influenced Herr Immerwahr in selecting the *Laconica* for special investigation are mainly three: that the characteristics of Pausanias' method of compilation are most clearly seen in it; that the author from whom the local information was derived can in this case be certainly determined; and that a remarkable interest attaches to the contents themselves. The inquiry is carried out with much acuteness, and the conclusion to which Kalkmann had pointed, that Sosibius, the Lacedæmonian grammarian and compiler, who lived in the middle of the third century B.C., was extensively used by Pausanias, is amply confirmed. The historical introduction to the *Laconica*, which Pausanias, in accordance with the method which he has pursued in other sections of his work, prefixes to the descriptive part, is found to be derived in its main outlines from that writer, while it is amplified by facts derived from Herodotus, Ephorus and others; and he is accused of an uncritical 'contamination' of these authorities. The investigation is naturally much more difficult in the topographical than in the historical part, because of the absence of continuity in the narrative; but here also in parts Sosibius is thought to have furnished much information. Our suspicions of unfair treatment of the author are, however, aroused when we discover that, whenever the mention of exact details on Pausanias' part involving a knowledge of the relative position of buildings is found, these are at once attributed to the use of a supposed local handbook. We may fairly ask whether the facts are incompatible with the hypothesis of personal observation; and

whether there is not some difficulty in supposing that topographical notices, which Leake and other well-qualified observers have found to be singularly trustworthy, were compiled from a variety of sources by a bookworm in his study.

H. F. TOZER.

Greece; Handbook for Travellers. By KARL BAEDEKER, 1889. 10s.

THE value of Baedeker's *Handbook of Greece*, as it originally appeared in German, has long been recognized by travellers; but the English work, which has just appeared, is more than a mere translation of this, for some parts have been recast and others amplified, while the editor himself has visited the country in order to make the practical suggestions contained in it more complete, and in respect of special points assistance has been given by Dr. J. T. Clarke, Professor Mahaffy, Dr. Sandys, and Mrs. Lewis, of Cambridge. The number of the plans of interesting localities has been considerably increased, those of Eleusis, Delos, Delphi, the Hieron of Epidaurus, Sparta, and Messene being all new. In the prefatory portion, Professor Kekulé's 'History of Greek Art' is a most valuable summary of that subject; and the other introductory sections—on the modern language, the condition of the country and its inhabitants, travelling facilities, &c.—comprise a large amount of serviceable information. Of the descriptions of Greece and the objects of interest which it contains, we can only say that it is wonderful that so much accurate and well-digested learning should have been brought together into so narrow a compass. If we may single out one point which deserves especial commendation, the accounts of the principal battles, in connection with the places where they were fought, appear to us remarkably good. It is only in the descriptions of the more outlying districts that any deficiency in the treatment makes itself felt. Thus Olympus, Ossa, and Pelion are scarcely noticed; yet the summit of Pelion, which is easily ascended, commands one of the most striking views in Greece, and the sea-slopes of that mountain and Ossa, with their luxuriant vegetation, are of almost unique beauty. Similarly, though an account of Delos has been added in this edition, yet the Cyclades generally are untouched, and the famous volcano of Santorin is only referred to in a few lines. We would also recommend to the editor that in another edition he should follow the example of Murray's *Handbook of Greece*, and include in his survey certain districts which are essentially connected with the subject of Greece, though they do not form part of the Greek Kingdom, as Crete, the peninsula of Athos, and the northern islands of the Aegean Sea.

H. F. TOZER.

Ancient History for Colleges and High Schools. By WILLIAM F. ALLEN and P. V. N. MYERS, Pt. I. The Eastern Nations and Greece. By P. V. N. MYERS. Boston. Ginn & Co. 1888. pp. x. 369. Introd. Price. \$1. 40.

THE plan of this book by President Myers of Belmont College, Ohio, is certainly excellent. The first 150 pages contain an outline of the history and civilization of the Eastern Nations, while the remainder of Pt. I. is devoted to Greece. A useful feature of the book is the endeavour to show the connexion of events, and to present the history as a whole rather than as a collection of isolated facts. The prominence given to the Hellenic spirit as manifested in

history, literature, and art, gives the book a character widely different from that of the usual general history.

But these excellences in the general plan and spirit of the work are marred by some serious defects in the execution of details. These faults consist chiefly of inaccurate statements in regard to matters of fact; sometimes the proportion of events is not duly preserved, and frequently valuable space is occupied with matter that might well be omitted. Perhaps the most startling error is the statement (p. 204) that the Court of Areopagus condemned Socrates to death. On p. 173 the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are treated as specimens of the literature of the heroic age, though on p. 308 the modern view of those poems is given with substantial accuracy. On p. 298 considerable space is given to Praxiteles, but it is chiefly occupied with doubtful statements about the Venus de Medici and the Niobe group, while not a word indicates the present existence of the unquestioned Hermes. So, although half a page (300) is given up to the Colossus of Rhodes, not a word is said of the Pergamene sculptures, and the kingdom of Pergamus is dismissed with a foot-note on p. 276. Space will not permit any further citations. The faults should be corrected in a second edition, for the book is at once admirable in conception and perfect in mechanical execution. The History of Rome which forms part of the volume does not require notice, since it is to be superseded during the present year by a new work by Professor W. F. Allen of the University of Wisconsin. J. M. PATON.

Middlebury College, Vt.

The Classical Element in the N. T. considered as a Proof of its Genuineness: with an Appendix on the oldest Authorities used in the Formation of the Canon. By CHARLES H. HOOLE, M.A., Student of Christ Church, Oxford. Macmillan, 1888. pp. 146. 10s. 6d.

THE classical element is treated under four heads: 1. The classical proper names; 2. The official titles and legal expressions; 3. The quotations from classical writers; 4. The inscriptions. The argument is that in such things numerous mistakes would have been made had the Books of the N. T. been the spurious productions of a later age. The argument is an old and a strong one; and as regards the proper names Mr. Hoole has drawn it out in much detail. This section is just half the volume. The section respecting official titles and legal expressions might with advantage have been made more full, Paley's *Evidences*, to say nothing of recent commentaries, would have helped Mr. Hoole to other instances. One turns with expectation to the section on inscriptions. It is almost as disappointing as the famous chapter on snakes in Ireland. This section on inscriptions in the N. T. begins with the words; 'Only one occurs,'—the one in Acts xvii. 23, which consists of two words—ΑΓΝΩΣΤΩΙ ΘΕΩΙ. Might it not have gone into a section on allusions to pagan religions? Yet another section might have been added on Greek and Roman customs, games, arms, and the like. The book is welcome as an instalment: as yet there are many omissions.

A. PLUMMER.

Akademische Vorträge, von T. von DÖLLINGER. Erster Band. Nördlingen. Beck, 1888. pp. iv. 427. Mk. 7.50.

THIS is a collection of addresses delivered by the venerable author either as Rector of the University of Munich or as President of the Royal Academy of

Bavaria, an honour to which he succeeded on the death of Baron Liebig. They are on a great variety of subjects; and although only two of them can strictly speaking be said to come within the scope of the *Classical Review*, yet the whole volume may be heartily commended to all who are interested in the philosophical study of history. The writer is probably the only living scholar whose knowledge of universal history could be compared to the great German historian, whose death is still fresh in our memories, Leopold von Ranke. One or two of the present addresses were noticed in English periodicals soon after they were delivered: e.g. the one on the Influence of Greek Literature and Culture on the West in the Middle Ages was translated almost in full in the *Guardian*, and that on Madame de Maintenon was reproduced at considerable length in the *Churchman*. Any one who would translate the whole of the present volume would be doing excellent work; and those who can read it in the original will be glad to have it in its present form both for reading and for reference. It is to be hoped that it will have a wide circulation in Europe. A. P.

Aristotle and the Christian Church, an Essay by Brother AZARIAS of the Brothers of the Christian Schools: Kegan Paul, 1888; pp. vi. 141. 3s. 6d.

THE writer believes that he can 'place, for the first time, before the English reader, the true record of the attitude of the Church towards the Aristotelian Philosophy, from its condemnation by the Council of Paris in 1209 to its full recognition by the Legates of Pope Urban V. in 1366,'—'hitherto a vexed question, but ill-understood and ill-explained.' His view is that the Church did not first try to suppress Aristotle, and then (finding that this was impossible) grant an unwilling sanction to the study of his writings; but that it objected to the corrupt translations of his works which grossly misrepresented Aristotle's teaching, and that it encouraged the study of his works in the improved translations of Michael Scott and others. A brief of Gregory IX., April 23, 1231, is specially appealed to, which commands that 'certain books of natural philosophy which have been condemned by the provincial council at Paris' shall be carefully examined with a view to 'remove whatever is erroneous, or of scandal, or in the least offensive to the readers, so that, after the removal of what is suspected, the remainder may be studied without delay and without offence.' But this language seems to point rather to an expurgated edition of the works indicated, than to a critical revision of the text. Aristotle was considered dangerous, and the study of his works had been forbidden. The prohibition had been disregarded; and therefore Gregory IX. recommended that the dangerous portions should be omitted and the remainder commended.

The writer of the essay also endeavours to defend Gregory the Great against the charge of condemning the study of classical literature. 'Gregory learns that a bishop gives his time and attention to the teaching of letters, doubtless at the sacrifice of his more imperative duty of administering his diocese and furthering the kingdom of God among his people; and forthwith Gregory rebukes him severely for undertaking to teach youths pagan myths when in all probability their souls were famishing for the bread of Christian truth' (*Epp.* xi. 54). Therefore it was not because he neglected his diocese in order to teach heathen literature that Gregory rebuked him, but because he taught the classics when he might have taught the Bible. See also the letter to Desiderius (*Epp.* ix. 48).

The Essay contains useful information respecting the study of philosophy in the middle ages, and rightly maintains that, while the form is often Aristotelian, the spirit is Christian and therefore Divine.

A PLUMMER.

Abhandlungen Zur Alten Geschichte, von ADOLF SCHMIDT, weiland Professor der Geschichte in Jena. Gesammelt und herausgegeben von Franz Rühl, Professor in Königsberg. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 12 Mk.

THE chief work of Wilhelm Adolf Schmidt was done in the field of modern history. His 'Tableaux de la Revolution française' and his 'Pariser Zustände während der Revolutionszeit,' are widely known and appreciated. Yet the foundations of his reputation as a scholar were laid by his discussions on ancient history, and to the scene of his first labours he returned in his last years. In response to many requests from old friends and pupils, Prof. Rühl has collected from various periodicals twelve of these discussions into a volume. Nine of the twelve originally appeared between 1834-1848; the other three were published in the *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* in 1885-86.

The subject-matter is divided between Greek and Roman history in the proportion of two to one. The dissertations on Greek history deal chiefly with the history of the Gauls in Eastern Europe, of the Diadochi, and with matters of chronology; those on Roman history are elaborate studies of the political changes which took place at the beginning and in the early decades of the empire. The Greek essays appeal to the antiquarian; the Roman to the student of political forces.

The first selection in the volume is Schmidt's dissertation for the doctorate, which was presented at Berlin in 1834 and is dedicated to Boeckh and von Raumer. It is entitled 'De fontibus veterum auctorum in enarrandis expeditionibus a Gallis in Macedoniam atque Graeciam susceptis.' He concludes that the source from which Diodorus, Trogus or Justin, and particularly Pausanias drew their facts about the *Galatae* was the now lost work of Timaeus of Tauromenium. Timaeus was a gossip, uncritical writer, and was followed uncritically. Again in 1837, in a review of the first part of Droysen's *Hellenismus* and in a separate essay: 'Ist Demochares oder Timaeos die Quelle der gangbaren Erzählung von den gallischen Einfällen?' Schmidt defended his opinion against Droysen's conjecture that Demochares was the source. He concluded that the current narrative of the Gallic invasion of the third century was derived from Timaeus, while the truer account, as it can be gathered from detached statements in Polybius, Athenaeus, and others, was based on Nymphis. Both of these subsequent essays are in the present volume. The history of the Gauls in the East is also the main topic of the long essay entitled 'Das Olbische Psephisma zu Ehren des Protogenes.' The thoroughgoing review of Droysen on the history of Alexander's successors has already been referred to. The next two papers are antiquarian in their character and, as they appeared in the *Jahrbücher* in 1885 and 1886, are probably familiar to many readers of *The Classical Review*. The first is on 'Der boiotische Doppel-Kalender.' The second discusses 'Das cleusinische Steuerdecret aus der Höhezeit des Perikles: Attischer Kalender und Attisches Recht,' and comprises about one hundred pages. The text is the puzzling expression: 'μήνα δὲ ἑκατομβαιῶνα τὸν νέον ἔρχοντα.' Schmidt concludes that this does not refer to the intercalation of a day into the month Hecatombaeon

(Foucart), nor to the intercalation of a whole month named Hecatombaeon (Lipsius and Sauppe). On the contrary he argues that the phrase is a legal one and refers to an extension of time and to the final date for the bringing in of the sacrificial first-fruits. As this extension would run over into the time of the next archon it would properly be decreed by him. The archon to fix the date must be the one who could prosecute delinquents. In a case like this, where the time set lapped over into the new year, the old archon could not prosecute. The essay takes up in detail many points about the Attic Calendar and Attic law, and, in particular, the law and practice in respect to 'terms' (Fristlehre). The three essays which occupy the most of the two hundred pages on Roman history and deal with the transition from the Republic to the Empire are the fruit of the same studies which resulted in the author's 'Geschichte der Denk- und Glaubensfreiheit im ersten Jahrhundert.' They discuss respectively: 'Der Verfall der Volksrechte in Rom unter den ersten Kaisern,' 'Das Zeitungswesen der Römer,' and 'Die Umbildung der römischen Republik in die Monarchie.' A fourth essay, much shorter, takes up 'Die Reformsbestrebungen des Kaisers Galba.' The essay on Roman journalism is an exceedingly interesting piece of work. It is at once a study of a feature of Roman social and political life, and of the primary sources of the Roman historians. The analysis of the passages referring to the *acta* (usually called *βρομῆματα* by Dio) shows a remarkable range of contents, and we are led to believe that if printing could have been invented at that time journalism would have forthwith sprung up full armed. The tone of this Roman 'Days Doings' (the full title was probably "Acta populi Romani diurna") was surprisingly modern. We find it serving as a Court Journal, reporting Livia's receptions, or the presence of Commodus at the games; as an 'inspired' or 'reptile' press, used by the emperor to create public opinion against political opponents; as an official publication like Court Reports, the Congressional Record, or better, the old *Moniteur*; even as a *Chronique Scandalouse* under imperial patronage. In the *Acta* were recorded burials, local ordinances, descriptions of buildings, remarkable natural phenomena, strange accidents, anecdotes, executions, and 'personals' e.g. births, deaths, marriages, divorces, etc. among the higher classes. That there was withal a strict censorship in force under the Empire goes without saying. The essay on the transformation of the republic into a monarchy is a study of great interest and suggestiveness. It shows that Schmidt was not only a learned scholar, but also an historian of philosophic grasp. As one reads the analysis of the political movement of the times, many modern parallels spring to mind, and one cannot rise from this essay without being more deeply impressed not so much with the modernness of ancient history, as with the ancientness of much of modern history.

Prof. Rühl deserves great credit for the judgment and skill with which he has edited the volume.

EDWARD G. BOURNE.

Adelbert College, Cleveland.

Entwicklungsgeschichte des substantivierten Infinitivs, von DR. FRANZ BIRKLEIN (Stuber, 1888: 109 pp.). 4 Mk.

Der freie formelhafte Infinitiv der limitation im Griechischen, von DR. L. GRÜNENWALD (Stuber, 1888: 37 pp.). Mk. 1.80

THESE volumes belong to a series edited by M. Schanz (*Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der Griechischen*

Sprache), and consist of statistical examinations of certain uses of the Infinitive. The results arrived at are not of startling novelty, but both works contain full digests of instances which will be found useful by grammarians and editors.—Dr. Birklein traces the development of the substantival use of the infinitive from Homer to Xenophon. In Homer and Hesiod we find the bare infinitive (present) as subject, e.g. κ 73 ὃ γὰρ μοι θέμις ἐστὶ κομίζεμεν οὐδ' ἀποπέμπειν (into the origin of this construction Dr. Birklein does not enter: cf. Monro *Hom. Gram.* p. 157), but not the infin. with τὸ (in v 52 analogy points to τὸ being the demonstrative pronoun). Pindar and the lyric poets have the infin. with τὸ, but not with τοῦ, τῆς. In certain (later?) plays of Aeschylus (*Agam.*, *Suppl.*, *Prom.*) we find occasional instances of τοῦ, τῆς, with infin. (5 in all). In Thucydides, the orators, Plato and Xenophon this use is fully developed, the infinitive phrase or clause being treated exactly on the same footing as a noun. Incidentally the author finds occasion to defend the MS. reading τοῦ μὴ with infin. dependent on a verb of 'hindering' or 'removing' in a number of passages (e.g. Herod. I. 86, Thuc. I. 76, 2, Demosth. 23, 149, Plat. *Laws* 637c, Xen. *Cyr.* II. 4, 23) which have been altered by Hertlein and Dindorf on the ground that the construction is illogical: Dr. Birklein might have supported his contention by comparing the Latin constructions *cave ne facias* and *cave facias*, which are precisely equivalent.

Dr. Grünwald discusses the 'infinitive of limitation' (e.g. in ἐκὼν εἶναι, ὀλίγου δεῖν, τὸ ἐπὶ σφῶς εἶναι, τὸ νῦν εἶναι, εἰκάσαι, συμβάλλειν, ἀκοῦσαι, ἰδεῖν, εἰδέναι, ὡς ἔπος εἰπέναι, ὡς εἰπέναι, εἰπέναι), maintaining that this use of the infin. is analogous to an accusative of limitation: so too in such phrases as ὀλίγου ἔσμεν ἄμυνεν, 'we are few as to ἄμυνεν.' All such infinitives serve to limit a thought or the form in which a thought is expressed. The author does not deny that historically the infinitive is a dative (or locative: cf. Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*, p. 93) of a *nomen actionis*; but he holds that in the above-mentioned use it is felt as an adverbial accusative, and that when dependent on a verb like ζητῶ, δύναμαι, &c., it is felt as 'eine unmittelbare Ergänzung zum Verbum.' In drawing this general distinction between the historical origin of a form and its function in a certain usage the author appears to be quite on the right lines; but whether in function the 'limiting accus.' is more nearly related to an accusative of limitation or to the original dative meaning of the infinitive (ἄμυνεν 'with a view to ἄμυνεν') is a point on which it is more difficult to pronounce: in favour of the view that in ζητῶ μμείσθαι, δύναμαι ποιῆσαι the infinitive is most simply regarded as an object, a good deal might be said. Why does not Dr. Grünwald use the term 'object' instead of 'accusative' when maintaining this point? 'Accusative' is a term denoting a *form*, and cannot be properly applied to the Greek infinitive. In the course of the investigation reasons are given for holding with Madvig and a minority of German grammarians that in τὸ νῦν εἶναι, τὸ does not go with εἶναι, but that εἶναι is added to the phrase τὸ νῦν: in ὀλίγου δεῖν analogy points to δεῖν being an infinitive, not a participle as maintained by Usener and others.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

Latin Lyric Verse Composition. By J. H. LUPTON. Macmillan and Co. 3s.

This little book must be regarded chiefly as a school book, and secondarily as a collection of modern lyrics. From the first point of view there is one unqualified ground of commendation: the transla-

tions are almost always elegant and poetical; but this necessitates an excessive amount of help, which might have been avoided if the English were bolder. This is however a fault, if a fault, on the right side. But then is this real training in the art of writing lyrics, which we will assume, though it is a large assumption, to be an art attainable in this overcrowded age by advanced scholars? I venture to think this would be far better taught by original exercises unfettered by the exigencies of translation, and there are very few of these in Mr. Lupton's book. The late Mr. Munro is credibly reported to have said that the only lyrics since Horace are to be found in *Lucretius*, a book composed for the use of Eton boys. These are in no instance translations, nor are they, as is too often the case with modern lyrics, mere centos of Horatian phrases. Whether they bear out Mr. Munro's high eulogium any one may judge by ordering the key. In Mr. Lupton's collection are pieces of various merit, but few absolutely faultless. Some of the best are the Asclepiads at the end of the book, though the rule he lays down for the Pherecratean verse, that it must end with a long syllable, is four times violated. Mr. Lupton is a purist in language, and protests against the intrusion of the silver age in the Horatian lyric. As however most of the exercises are the work of other pens, he is unable to exclude offenders. So we find 'profligere,' 'dulcissonus,' 'suavisonus,' 'blandiloquus,' 'alescere,' 'mellitior,' 'calyx,' 'expandere,' 'aeva,' 'caelos,' 'hymnus'; 'terrenus amor' is hardly justified by 'terrenum equitem'; and 'bees' must have had a sheepish sound to a Roman ear. 'Ast,' a word disallowed by Mr. Lupton, also occurs, and he has himself written 'audiri' in despite of his own canon, when 'audii' would have served his purpose as well. The use of 'gremium' for 'the heart' has been long exploded. 'Senilis' is strangely used for 'senex' three times in a translation from a chorus of Euripides.

But the line laid down by Mr. Lupton is too hard and fast; in many cases a well-trained ear with careful study may be trusted to decide whether a given word is or is not admissible, that is, whether Horace would have used it if he had wanted it.

There is a false print, 'negante' for 'neganti' in Ex. 10, and presumably an omission: 'sophia (en!) recenti' in Ex. 30. Twice the abl. of the comparative in -i- occurs, a form wholly unknown to the golden age.

Some grammatical points require attention. Unless the ordinary doctrine of the sequence of tenses has been completely upset by recent investigations, what is to be said for (16)—

Vindictet divum sibi quisque munus,
mente quae surgunt prohibente nullo ut
verba referret.

The subjunctive with 'dum' is scarcely defensible in Exx. 5, 32, 51. que—et, Exx. 21, 22, is at least very rare. Can 'suscitet cordi' mean 'awaken in my heart,' and 'mihi moreris' 'die for me'? 'triste mane oritur' is not admissible, 'mane' being almost always used as an adverb; never with a distinctive epithet such as 'triste' and never with any verb but 'sum.' 'benignis suppliciis' can hardly mean 'kindly punishments,' or 'lubens funus' 'a voluntary death.' But strangest of all is 'quando' in the sense of 'whenever,' Ex. 45.

Again, how all-important is the order of words. What is to be made of—

docuitque chartis
prudens honestum prava loquentibus
servare tortum.

or
amota terrae tantus amor fugae
desideranti.

or
quicquid amabile
fallebat, ut quondam vagantis,
sponte redit, simulacra somni.

Such criticisms as the above are not intended as specimens of the lyrics, many of which are admirable; but, as the book is intended mainly to teach boys, nothing should be admitted which is not unexceptionable, and a lyric, like a sonnet, ought to be a perfectly polished gem. There is no excuse for nodding.

E. D. STONE.

The Order of Words in the Ancient Languages compared with that of the Modern Languages. By HENRI WEIL. Translated, with Notes and Additions, by CHARLES W. SUPER, Ph.D., President of the Ohio University. Boston: Ginn and Company. 1887. Pp. 114. 5s.

PRESIDENT SUPER has rendered a genuine service to classical scholarship by translating this essay, written originally for the doctorate (1844), and given to the public in two subsequent editions (1869, 1879).

In the modern languages the order of words is so largely determined by the grammatical construction that the course of thought, especially in prose, is often disturbed by its dependence on the syntactical arrangement; divers shifts and inversions are needed to preserve a natural sequence of ideas: in short, these languages are not *free*, there is a tyranny of the analytic method, of the so-called 'logical order.' But the Latin and the Greek are free languages, the spiritual movement is independent of the syntactical movement, thought flows clear and unimpeded, ideas assert their rightful precedence, and all the powers of oral expression attain to full and perfect exercise. Such is the author's thesis: the statement of an obvious truth, to be sure, but forming the groundwork for a systematic development of principles that are often enough ignored and disregarded in spite of their cardinal importance. The reader attends with growing interest as the subject is unfolded step by step—the natural order of words, the pathetic order, the period, descending and ascending construction, rhetorical accent, the repose of emphasis: a treatment at once concise and far-reaching, and unincumbered by superfluous learning.

It is easy to anticipate the familiar corollaries that spring from such a theme, but they seem to gain renewed force as our author evolves and illustrates them. 'In translating from one language to another, if it is not possible to imitate at the same time the syntax of the original and the order of the words, retain the order of the words and disregard the grammatical relations.' And again: 'The great secret of a good translation is to find forms of expression which will allow the translator to adopt into a foreign idiom the order of words which is found in the original.' In *Darium vicit Alexander* ('Darius was conquered by Alexander'), something is said about Darius, not about Alexander. *Alexander* is, to be sure, the grammatical subject of *vicit*, but what of that? The consciousness must not be allowed to dwell on the grammatical relations; they are the postulates of speech, grammar is the *sine qua non* of intelligibility, and for that reason can be left to take care of itself where intelligent beings are concerned. *Δαρείου καὶ Παρυσάτιδος γίγνονται παῖδες δύο* ('Darius and Parysatis had two sons'): the sentence begins with a genitive case, but what of it? The function of the genitive was not burdening the mind of Xenophon

when he began his story, and the function of the genitive is not to be flourished in the face of the learner as if it were something grand and awful. Far more significant is the arrangement with its harmonious effects and concomitants. The grammatical construction, the analytic principle is constantly pulling the learner in the wrong direction, diverting him from the path and blinding him to that which above all things he needs to see. In order to clear the way for him, to encourage and inspire him, you must bear as constantly toward the opposite pole. Early positive instruction in languages should always be synthetic: the analytical part is negative. You do not want your boy or girl to be grammatical (heaven forbid!), but only not to be ungrammatical. What he needs to be instructed in is the concrete: the combined effect and force of what he reads and writes. Recite to him whole masses of sonorous Latin and Greek; make him read the same aloud to you in the same way. Let him learn choice passages by heart; give him a chance to acquire a wide and discriminating vocabulary; set him to writing Greek and Latin in imitation of the models daily presented to his ear; guide him to express ideas, however simple, with clearness, euphony and energy. Such are the lessons we draw from Professor Weil's thoughtful and interesting work.

The translation, in the main well done, is at some points not satisfactory. A passage on p. 47 is rendered wholly unintelligible by an ambiguous thrice-occurring *it*. Another awkward ambiguity in the last four words of p. 61 might have been avoided without sacrificing the order of words illustrated, but the example is not suited for translation, and should have been given in the original French. The Greek and Latin illustrative passages when translated at all should have been translated in accordance with the doctrine inculcated by the essay itself, but this has not always been done. The words on p. 71, *τὸν εἰς τὴν χορηγίαν δαπανῶντα οὐκ εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν τάξιν δεικνύοντα τῷ τοῦ χοροῦ διδασκάλῳ* (he who bears the expense of the representation ought not to be put in the same rank, &c.), are turned as follows: 'it is not necessary that we should put in the same rank him who bears the expense of the representation,' &c.—bungling and false for the French ('*il ne faut pas mettre, &c.*') as for the Greek. The version given for the last example on p. 65 is both obscure and wrong. Of misprints there are a great many in the Greek text, not many in the Latin and the French, *sciendam* p. 18, *soceram* p. 27, *ou* p. 74, *furtam* p. 79, *appidum* twice p. 113. On p. 27, by an oversight in copying apparently, the French text of the disapproved version from Horace is appended to the English that represents the approved version.

As regards the Notes, whether the author's own or those added by the translator, any debatable points which they happen to touch involve nothing that in the least affects the validity of the main thesis; they are judiciously put at the ends of the several chapters so that it is left to the reader to use them or not, as he may find it expedient.

ISAAC FLAGG.
Cornell University.

A Grammar of the Latin Language by E. A. ANDREWS and S. STODDARD. Revised by HENRY PREBLE of Harvard University. Boston. U. S. A. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1888. \$ 1.12.

THE ideal Latin grammar has not yet appeared, but such approaches have been made to a satisfactory standard that the credentials of any new comer are sure to be closely scanned. While a hearty welcome awaits any work that is the outcome of an inside and comprehensive grasp of Latin usages and that takes

due notice of the historic and cognate relations of the language, a mere revamping of an antiquated or obsolescent book or a mosaic of existing manuals hardly has a *raison d'être*.

When Andrews and Stoddard's Grammar appeared, now more than fifty years ago, it was distinctly superior to any kindred work to which American students had easy access and, after its revision in 1857, it was still for some time almost alone and unchallenged. Meanwhile not only have substantial advances been made in nearly every department of Latin scholarship, but new views have arisen as to the scope of a manual grammar. Few teachers now largely occupy their pupils with the vast multitude of details, the minute subdivision of constructive theories, and the deadening lists of exceptions to rules, which characterized the earlier grammars. Grammatical minutiae are much less treated as an end in themselves: the object is rather to get on, and intelligently to study the literature—not primarily as a verification of any grammarian's dicta, but as the expression and revelation of a wonderful civilization.

For those who still believe in the old method, Professor Preble has spoiled Andrews and Stoddard's Grammar by his free contraction, expansion, and rearrangement of the original, and by his insertion of modern matter. On the other hand we do not feel that he has brought the book up to the level of two or three current manuals.

The prominent facts of the language are in this revision somewhat relieved of their former mechanical statement, but there is slight suggestiveness toward an insight into the genesis and logic of constructions. Thus, no attempt is made to grapple with and explain such genuine Latinisms as the ablative absolute, the historical infinitive, indirect narrative, and the gerundial usages. The philology of the book is scrappy and inconclusive. There are glib references (§287) to the 'parent language,' but nowhere is there a synoptical or other sketch of the relations between Latin and its congeners. We are tantalizingly told (§403) that 'it has been a common theory that the original use of the ablative was to denote separation, but that the better opinion is that such is not the case.' Later on (§415) it is asserted that 'the ablative of separation is a variety of the ablative of specification.'

The editor calls special attention to his chapter on Word-Formation, but the treatment seems to us far less clear and scientific than in the corresponding sections of Greenough or Roby.

There are still so many unsolved problems in Latin syntax that here, certainly, dogmatism is out of place. We doubt if any scholars can accept Professor Preble's view of the genitive with *interest* (§368), or with words of fulness (§409 a), or the ablative with *opus* (§417), or the dative of the agent (§383 b).

More than anywhere else the reviser claims originality for his theory as to the order of words in Latin; but, as he frankly states (§599) that it would 'take too much space to set forth the reasons for his opinion,' we are left to his *ipse dixit*. After carefully going through his examples and statements we must still believe that there were heroes before Agememnon. As a general rule it may be admitted—particularly for the extremes of a Latin sentence—that the order of words was largely determined by the degree of emphasis. But in a very large part of Latin literature we cannot feel—and probably the Romans themselves did not feel—any such diminuendo scale of emphasis as Professor Preble assumes. He carries the principle so far that it becomes over-rigid and forced; it leaves too little play for the natural elasticity of an inflected language; it ignores the unmistakable differences in different authors and periods; it takes too little account of euphony, chiasm, alliteration, and other more subtle devices of the Roman stylists; it disregards the free and often interlocked order of metrical composition.

The marking of long vowels throughout the grammar is a commendable feature, though the proof-reading has here been carelessly done. We have noticed, among other slips, *serēnus*, *semila*, *nobis*, *qualis*, *mānum*.

It is refreshing to find that Professor Preble ignores entirely the 'English method' of pronouncing Latin. It is certainly a reproach that this method is still advocated by some of the responsible guardians of Latin scholarship. The method ought long since to have followed the Ptolemaic system of astronomy into the limbo of unscientific curiosities.

TRACY PECK,
Yale University.

A LAST WORD.

I have but a few words to add in reference to Mr. Wilson's attempt at replying to my criticisms. I am in no wise concerned, as I have already said, with his opinion of my scholarship and philosophy, but only with his imputations of *mala fides*. I therefore refrain from all comment on his remarks, except as regards the point which he puts forward as a test question between himself and me and which beyond doubt answers that purpose admirably.

In attempting to justify his assertion that I attack Martin in a certain passage, he quotes part of my animadversions upon the contrary motion which, as is commonly thought, Plato assigns to Venus and Mercury.

This is no theory of Martin's, but a popular and obvious interpretation of Plato's words, which Martin repeats, presumably because he saw nothing better for it, but to which he urges the gravest objection. The passage cited from my note strongly emphasises the objection which Martin felt, and which any one must feel, to this astronomical hypothesis, and simply amplifies a sentence in the very same note, which is this: 'Now, as Martin observes, the theory of contrary motion is flagrantly inadequate to account for those facts.' The 'attack upon Martin' is actually and expressly an argument on Martin's side.

Now Mr. Wilson either saw this or he

did not: the inference in either case need not be precisely specified. He may then write a pamphlet, or (as perhaps his style would lead us to expect) a stout quarto, without being troubled by any more observ-

ations on my part. Far be it from me to interfere with this austere moralist in the execution of what he 'conceives a public duty.'

R. D. ARCHER-HIND.

NOTES.

ON II. XI. 306, and HOR. OD. I. 7. 15.

ὡς ὅποτε νέφεα Ζέφυρος στυφελίῃ
ἀργεστάῳ Νότοιο, βαθεῖν λαίλαπι τύπτων

On this Mr. Leaf says 'ἀργεστάῳ as φ 334. From its use here it may perhaps mean "bringing bright white clouds:" it can hardly be compared with the *albus notus* of Horace which *deterget nubila caelo*.' It appears to me there are two ways out of the slight difficulty: (1) to say with Paley that ἀργεστής means 'clearing' (a sense which it certainly had in later times) and that it is a 'standing epithet' of Νότος. The fact that the epithet is peculiarly inapplicable is no objection, as we find e.g. O 371 Nestor in the daylight raising his hands εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα, Ψ 304 the horses of Antilochus are ὠκύποδες though in 310 Nestor calls them βάροιστοί θείειν, ζ 26 clothes that want washing are called σιγαλόεντα, and I do not doubt that *saporiferumque paraver* in *Aen.* IV. 486 is to be thus explained viz. as a standing epithet which happens to be singularly inappropriate to the context. But this explanation is not one to be adopted without necessity and it is *really*, as I try to show below, inconsistent with Horace. (2) 'Αργεστής however in Homer certainly appears to have the sense given to it by Mr. Leaf (and by Mr. Monro) and in this case I think it may be maintained that the inconsistency with Horace is only apparent and not real. Horace's words are *Albus ut obscuro deterget nubila caelo Saepe Notus, neque parturit imbres Perpetuo*, of which the lesson is, as Mr. Wickham says, 'the very same wind which brings the clouds will presently clear them.' Notus *usually* brings rain (and therefore 'clearing' can hardly be a standing epithet of it) but *sometimes* shows itself in the character of 'clearing' and is then called 'albus' and in Greek λευκόνотος. *Albus* is not an epithet but is almost predicative. In later writers 'Αργεστής (paroxystone) is the name of a wind, in Hes. *Theog.* 379, 380, an easterly wind nearly equivalent to *Eurus*, but in other writers a north-west wind, cf. Ap. Rh. ii. 961 and Plin. *N.H.* ii. § 119, who follows Aristotle in his description.

R. C. SEATON.

* *

EURIPIDES, *Hippolytus* I. 32.

- καὶ πρὶν μὲν ἐλθεῖν τήνδε γῆν Τροίηνιαν,
30 πέτραν παρ' αὐτὴν Παλλὰδος καθύψιον
γῆς τήσδε ναὸν Κύπριδος ἐγκαθίστατο,
ἔρωσ' ἔρωτ' ἔκ δ' ἡλ' οὐ' Ἰππολύτω δ' ἔπει
τὸ λοιπὸν ὠνόμαζεν ἰδρύσθαι θεά.
ἐπεὶ δὲ Θησεὺς Κεκροπίαν λείπει χθόνα,
35 μίasma φεύγων αἵματος Παλλαντιδῶν,
καὶ τήνδε σὺν δάμαρτι ναυστολεῖ χθόνα,
ἐναυσίαν ἔκδημον αἰνέσας φυγὴν,
ἐνταῦθα δὲ στένονσα κἀκτεπληγμένη
κέντροις ἔρωτος ἡ τάλαρ' ἀπόλλυται
40 σιγῇ· κ.τ.λ.

In line 32 the MSS. vary between ἔκδηλον and ἔκδημον. From a critical point of view it is evident that neither the one nor the other can be right. ἔκδηλον is too simple for any one to think of changing it to ἔκδημον, while ἔκδημον itself clearly comes from I. 37. Aphrodite is comparing Phaedra's behaviour at Athens with her different behaviour at Troezen, and it is clear that the original word, which scribes have replaced by ἔκδηλον or ἔκδημον, described a phase of passion, with which the sighs and love-pains of II. 38 *σηγ.* are contrasted. I read therefore with tolerable certainty

ἔρωσ' ἔρωτ' ἔκ δ' ἡλ' οὐ'.

ἔκλος, calm, is a most suitable word to describe a love that knows neither violent delights nor violent sorrows, and it is sufficiently uncommon in iambic trimeters to have been misread by one scribe as ἔκδηλον and altered by another to ἔκδημον, suggested by *φυγὴν ἔκδημον* a few lines below.

J. B. BURY.

* *

EURIPIDES, *Medea*, 511.

τοίγαρ με πολλαῖς μακαρίαν Ἑλληνίδων
ἔθηκες ἀντὶ τῶνδε· θανυμαστὸν δὲ σε

511 ἔχω πῶσιν καὶ πιστὸν ἢ τάλαρ' ἔγώ, κτλ.

Mr. Verrall's note on πιστόν is as follows:—

'This word hardly fits the context, which points to something nearer in sense to *θανυμαστόν*, and as the grammarian Alexander gives the quotation *σεμνόν* for *πιστόν* (Walz. p. 451) Nauck conjectured *σεπτόν*, but this form can hardly have been in common use and correction is not absolutely necessary, so (following Prinz) I have kept the text.'

The text is certainly right. The apparent unfitness of the word in the context disappears if we recognize that Euripides is playing on the double sense of πιστός (α. πείθω, β. πίνω). πιστός from πίνω occurs in the *Prometheus* I. 480; πιστικός, 'liquid,' in the New Testament. *Medea* suggests the comparison of Jason to a draught, πόσις, distasteful to drink.

Mr. H. Macnaghten's excellent emendation in *Helena*, 297, put forward in a late number of the *Classical Review* (p. 72) furnishes a parallel to the play on πόσις.

I have noticed two other passages in the *Medea*, where the poet seems to be using words in a double sense, or rather suggesting a sense other than the obvious one. (1) I. 279 κοῦκ ἔστιν ἄτης εὐπρόσοιστος ἔκβασις, where the metaphor is from a storm at sea. ἄτης ἔκβασις Mr. Verrall renders by 'storm-landing,' but he does not observe Euripides probably intended to suggest ἄω, ἄημι as the derivation of ἄτη. (2) In the difficult lines 106-108 δῆλον δ' ἀρχῆς ἐξαιρόμενον νέφος οἰμαγῆς ὡς τάχ' ἀνάψει μελίσσι θυμῷ, it seems possible that either the etymon of θυμῷ

(Lat. *fumus*; compare *θυμῶν*), or perhaps actually an archaic use of the word in the sense of smoke, was in the poet's mind.

J. B. BURY.

* *

PLAUTINA, *Mostellaria*, iii. 2, line 803 *sqq.*—The plays upon certain words in this passage, noted by Mr. Strong in the Feb. issue of the *Classical Review*, seem on the whole forced and very doubtful.

His first conjecture that in the line 'ante aedes vestibulum et ambulacrum quouismodi' there may well lurk some *double entente* like 'scarecrow and walking gentlemen' is unacceptable. What relation is there between the Latin words and these conjectural ideas, which could have caused the latter to arise in the minds of the spectators? Nor does it seem to me that we are warranted in inferring from the line 'Age specta, postes quouismodi! Quanta firmitate facti et quanta crassitudine'—that Plautus means to say, 'look at these blockheads! how impossible and how stupid!' Neither 'crassus' nor 'crassitudo' are used by Plautus with any such derived meaning; the only place where 'crassus' occurs with another meaning than the literal one, 'thick' or 'heavy,' being in the *Rudens*, 3, 5, 53, where we find 'crasso infortunio' which Lambinus explains 'quod crassae hae clavae tibi dabunt.' 'Firmitas' is never, so far as I have been able to discover, used with any such disparaging idea implied, and would not suggest it to the audience. The illustration from Ovid certainly involves an unnatural interpretation of that passage. Mr. Strong's taking *excisos* as the participle of *excindere* relieves any one from the necessity of examining his arguments in that paragraph, and in the last paragraph he fails to note the function of the gerundive.

SAMUEL B. PLATNER.
Adelbert College.

* *

TERENCE, *Phorm.* V. i. (ii.) 1—5. (766—770.)

Nostripe culpa facinus ut malis expediat esse, dum nimium dici nos bonos discemus et benignos. *Ila fugias ne praeter casam*, quod aiunt. Nonne id sat erat, accipere ab illo injuriam? etiam argentumst ultro objectum, ut sit qui vivat, dum aliud aliquid flagiti conficiat.

'We have only ourselves to blame and our excessive eagerness to be called kind and liberal, that it pays me to be villains. What saith the proverb? . . . Wasn't it enough to be wronged by the scoundrel? we even gave him money into the bargain to live on while he's hatching another piece of mischief.'

I can nowhere find a tolerable explanation of the proverb in italics. Even Gronovius', which alone gives anything like sense, is put out of court by his rendering *casam* as *villam domini*. The commentators seem to have fettered themselves by assuming that another *fugias* must be understood after *casam*. But Cicero's letters are alone sufficient to prove how proverbial sayings are docked; *ἔρδοι τις [ἢ] ἑκαρτος εἰδὲν τίχνην*, Ar. *Pesp.* 1422), *μηδὲ δίκην, ταῖς δόματον ἡμῶν*, and a score of other examples will at once occur. So we may understand what we please to make the proverb yield the required sense. That sense seems to be, 'Don't throw good money after bad.' So I would suggest that some such phrase as *animam proficias*

completed the proverb. 'So cut and run, that you may not lose your life as well as (besides) your hut.—The first loss is best.'

Though this proposal may not find acceptance, it will perhaps suggest to scholars a fresh mode of attacking a problem that has certainly baffled all the methods hitherto attempted.

P. SANDFORD.

* *

CICERO, *Atticus* xiii. 30, 1.—Ciceronis epistolam tibi remisi. O te ferreum qui illis periculis non moveris. Me quoque accusat. Eam tibi epistolam misissem. Nam illam alteram de rebus gestis eodem exemplo puto.

There seems to be no satisfactory explanation of the subjunctive *misissem*. Boot says 'I should have sent the letter in which young Quintus accuses me to you, unless you had sent a similar one to me. Now there is no need. For all the rest of the contents of his letter you must know are the same as he has written to you.' But besides the harshness of the ellipse, Boot has to read *illa altera* and *puto*. The whole section makes one think that an epistolary perfect is required. Perhaps the original reading was *Eam epistolam tibi MISI SEMISSEM* 'I send you half of that letter (in which he accuses me); for the other half about his exploits I think is an exact copy of the letter he wrote to you.' For *epistolam semissem* compare Petron 64. 6 *panemque semissem ponebat super torum*. We can suppose that *semissem* was written *sssem* for *s* is a common abbreviation for *semis*.

L. C. PURSER.

* *

Cic. *Ep. ad Atticum*, 1. 14. 3.—Proximus Pompeio sedebam: intellexi hominem moveri, [utrum] Crassum inire eam gratiam, quam ipse praetermisisset, an esse tantas res nostras quae tam libenti senatu laudarentur, ab eo praesertim, qui mihi laudem illam eo minus deberet, quod meis omnibus literis in Pompeiana laude perstrictus esset. The text is that of Wesenberg, who gives the different MSS. readings as follows: moveri [utrum] Cr. (W.); m., u. Cr. marg., M.; vulgo, m. verum Cr. M.; m. incertum utrum Cr. (W.)? Most editors give the same text but do not think it necessary to bracket utrum. Now the facts about the passage are these: It contains a construction absolutely without parallel in all Latin, yet the difficulty is wholly ignored not only by all editors but also by every Grammar except those of Kuhner and Kruger. In these two passages from Livy are quoted, which however do not throw any light upon the present passage. If then utrum is retained we can only mark the difficulty and suppose that Cicero is responsible for a piece of unpardonably careless writing. But utrum need not be retained. The sentence has then only to be punctuated differently and we get the following—Intellexi hominem moveri Crassum inire eam gratiam quam ipse praetermisisset. An esse tantas res nostras quae tam libenti senatu laudarentur etc. 'I saw that Pompey was troubled at Crassus' establishing a claim for gratitude which he had failed to secure. Could it be that my exploits were so great etc.?' In this case the words an esse etc. give the thought that passed through Pompey's mind. Can it be, he thought to himself, that Cicero's exploits are really so great?

HUGH MACNAGHTEN.

* *

HORACE, *Epistles* I. i. 70-75.

Quodsi me populus Romanus forte roget, cur
Non ut porticibus, sic judiciis fruar isdem,
Nec sequar aut fugiam quae diligit ipse vel odit,
Olim quod volpes aegrotis cauta leoni
Respondit, referam: Quia me vestigia terrent,
Omnia te adversum spectantia, nulla retrorsum.

This passage is usually understood to mean that Horace is afraid to follow the people because such a path would lead him to destruction. But this is quite out of keeping with what follows. Horace asks 'Quid sequar aut quem?' and the next twenty lines are devoted to showing the great variety of pursuits and tastes to be found among the Roman people. Would it not be better to read a note of interrogation after *retrorsum*? The passage will then signify: 'In case the Roman people should ask me why I do not follow them, can I use the well-known answer of the fox, and say that I am afraid because the footsteps all point in the one direction? No: quite the contrary; what troubles me is that they all go different ways.'

H. S. McINTOSH.

HOR. *Carm.* III. 30.—The translation of the word *situ* given in the March number of the *Classical Review* has Nauck's authority in its favour; see his edition of the *Odes* and *Epodes*, Leipzig, 1885.

'So bildet *regali* mit *situ* = *squalore* ein Oxymoron, wofür wir umgekehrt sagen die verwitterte Herrlichkeit—d. i. die mit dem Schmutz des Alters überzogenen Prachtbauten—der Pyramiden. Auch *squalore obductae* waren diese noch immer *regales*.

F. E. ROCKWOOD,
Bucknell University.

'PSEUDO-AUGUSTINE' ON THE APOCALYPSE.—In the Appendix to the second volume of the Benedictine Augustine, col. 159 &c., an anonymous 'Expositio in Apocalypsim B. Johannis' is printed, which, the editors say, is largely borrowed from Primasius and Bede. It consists, in the printed form, of nineteen Homilies and preserves a rather interesting text of the Apocalypse. The only MS. authority specially named by the Benedictine editors is a certain MS. which then belonged to the Abbey of St. Peter at Chartres. The MS. numbered H. 6 in the Library of St. John's College Cambridge contains this commentary, which is there headed by the author's name—Gennadius of Marseilles. As I have not met with the identification elsewhere, I will give a short account of the MS. which contains it. It is in large 8vo., size 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ in. x 7 $\frac{1}{2}$, with 21 lines to a page, of late twelfth or early thirteenth century, in an English hand. The contents are: a. Four fine full-page outline drawings. 1. A nimbed bearded saint mending his pen. 2. St. John the Evangelist throned, full-face, and vested as a Bishop. The scribe at his feet. 3. The seven candlesticks, and the seven churches conventionally represented. 4. The Christ of the Apocalypse, seated.

b. Bede on the Apocalypse.

γ. 'Incipit tractatus Gennadii presbyteri Massilie de mille annis et de apocalypsi beati Johannis.'

δ. Folcard's Life of St. Botolph.

ε. Ambrose de laude jejunii mutilated at end. Gennadius mentions a tract under the name given in the MS. in his own list of his works (*De Vir. Illustr.*). Is this commentary really his? It contains hardly any note of time: in Hom. x. he says 'Utique habent potestatem haeretici, sed praecipue Ariani.' The period of the thousand years is only very cursorily dealt with; and judging from this and from the homiletical form of the work, Dr. Hort has suggested

the doubt whether our treatise could correctly be described as a work 'on the Thousand Years and the Revelation of John.' I should be very glad if some one who is familiar with the Latin commentators on the Apocalypse would say if the attribution in the St. John's copy is one frequently met with in MSS. and if there is any probability of its being correct. Of course, if it is, Gennadius must be put down as the source of Bede and Primasius. A good deal of matter, especially in the earlier parts of the commentary is drawn from the work attributed to Victorinus of Pettaw, and printed in the *Bibliothecae Veterum Patrum*.

It is to be noted that Gennadius speaks of 'tractatus de mille annis et de Apocalypsi beati Johannis' in the plural. There is a possibility, then, that this commentary may be the latter tract, while that on the Millennium has disappeared.

As to the text of the treatise given in this MS., it agrees for the most part with the variants quoted from 'MSS.' or MS. 'Petrensis' by the Benedictines. It leaves out excerpts from Ambrosius Autpertus and has the lacuna at the end of Hom. xvi. and beginning of Hom. xvii. thus making the work consist of eighteen and not nineteen Homilies. There are indications that this copy was made from an uncial archetype, and that some of the leaves in this latter were displaced.

MONTAGUE RHODES JAMES.

AREANI.—This word occurs in the history of Ammianus Marcellinus in connexion with affairs in Britain A.D. 369 (xxviii. 3, 8, extracted *Monumenta Hist. Britt.* I. xxiv.) The *areani* appear to have been an intelligence corps of the northern frontier of the province, and of old standing: 'genus hominum a veteribus institutum.' Marcellinus says that he had already mentioned them under the reign of Constant; but that part of his history is lost. He describes their duty, *officium*, as being 'ut ultro citroque per longa spatia discurrerent vicinarum gentium strepitus nostris ducibus intimarent.' Count Theodosius suppressed them for malversation. Does the word or name occur elsewhere? I cannot find it in Ducange or Bailey's *Facioliati* or in any of Smith's Dictionaries.

J. H. RAMSAY.

ARREPHORIA (see p. 187).—In reply to Miss Harrison's query in the April number of the *Review*, there seems to be no philological reason why 'Ἀρρηφώρα should not be connected with ἔρσαι or ἔρσαι. ἄρρη- goes back to the weaker form of the Stem seen in Sanskrit *vish-a-s*, the Indo-Germanic form for both being probably **vrs-ō-s*. Thence in Greek we might expect **Fapso*, **Fappo* but (1) *Fapphōphōros*: **Fappo* = θανατηφόρος: θάνατος, both being formed after compounds from *a* stems, *vuchōphoros*, &c. Another explanation of the *η* would be (2) that it was borrowed from the cognate form ἔρση, or (3) that it represents original *ā* if there was any object to be served by using the feminine stem.

To a certain extent this also supports the identification of ἔρσην with *vīshan* (Meyer, *Gr. Gr.* § 27) instead of with *gsha-bhā-s* (as Curtius, *Gr. Et.* 342).

P. GILES.

P. S.—May a novice in archaeology enquire if the *θηρία* in Theocritus II 67-8 have anything to do with religious observances of this kind, or whether the passage really refers to an Alexandrian πομπή of wild beasts, as the editors assume? Mr. H. T. Francis long ago compared the passage with Aristoph. *Lysist.* 645-6 (*Notes and Queries*, 4th series, vol. ii. p. 615).

P. G.

CLASSICAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

II.

UNTIL about twenty years ago, the expressions 'classical education' and 'liberal education' were in the United States universally regarded as synonymous. The student who aimed to obtain what was known as a liberal education was obliged to go through a course of study at college, in which Greek and Latin formed an essential part; at the successful completion of this course he received the degree of Bachelor of Arts. At the present time, however, although this degree is still looked upon as a sort of badge of a liberally educated person, the course of study which leads up to the degree is by no means prevailingly or even necessarily classical: in fact we hear much to-day of liberal education on a scientific basis, or upon the basis of the modern languages. The idea has gained acceptance that that which distinguishes liberal education from all other types of education is essentially the aim and methods of study rather than the things studied. And although this proper method and aim may with great success, perhaps with greatest success, be pursued when the Greek and Roman classics constitute the main materials of study, it by no means follows that these subjects are essential in all schemes of liberal education. This changed conception has had an effect upon our colleges and schools which in some cases has been almost revolutionary: it has led to the reorganization of the programmes for the Bachelor's degree, until at present there is no uniformity in this matter; it has reached down and modified popular education. Although classical studies have continued, in most of our colleges, to maintain their honourable position, and still form an important part in the education of the great majority of students in our colleges (at least of candidates for the B.A. degree), they too have been affected by the change of attitude: put, after a fashion, upon the defensive, their work has greatly gained in precision, force, and strength, and their methods have improved.

There are three distinctly marked stages in the course of classical studies as pursued among us: that of the 'preparatory' school, that of the college, and that of the university ('graduate' department). At school the boy learns the rudiments of Greek and Latin grammar, and reads small portions of the easier authors; at college his reading is extended, and he receives more or less instruction in various matters relating to Greek and Roman antiquity; in the graduate department of the university, as a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, he makes a professional study of the more important branches of classical philology, and is trained to become an original investigator. It now remains for me to describe in outline the characteristic features of these three stages in the life of the classical student.

The schools where the beginnings of a classical education are made are of several classes. Of the public 'high' schools, supported by the local authorities, not all furnish the rudiments of a classical education; this is done by these schools only in the eastern states and in some of the larger cities.¹ In

a few of our older communities, ancient institutions—as in Boston the Public Latin School—do this work, but as a rule, with the exceptions cited above, the beginner in classical studies must obtain his instruction at private institutions, either at the great endowed schools or academies (privately endowed), at ordinary private schools, or at the so-called preparatory department provided by some colleges (especially in the west). The range of classical studies at these schools is almost universally limited to the actual requisitions for admission to the Freshman class in college; as will be seen below, the average boy whose education is finished at school has seldom done more in the classics than to have learned the elements of Greek and Latin grammar, and to have read a little Caesar, Virgil, Cicero, Xenophon, and Homer. A few of the better preparatory schools, however, have of late begun to extend their course of classical study, at least by one year, so as to include some of the work done in college in the Freshman year. This is one of the happiest signs of the times; it means the enrichment of classical studies at a stage where enrichment is sadly needed, alike for teachers and for pupils.

The Phillips Academy, at Andover, Massachusetts, founded in 1778, may serve as an example of one of the best of our classical schools; it is the oldest school of its type and in its time has prepared more pupils for college than any other, whether public, private, or endowed. It has a classical and an English side; but we shall here speak only of the classical department. The age at entrance averages fifteen, and the course extends through four years, each of 38½ weeks. Before entrance the student must have been well grounded in arithmetic (through decimal fractions), the elements of English grammar, and in modern geography. The studies of the classical side are Latin, Greek, French or German, or French and German, mathematics, history, classical geography, physics, and English (language and literature, with much composition). Each pupil is expected to have at least sixteen hours of required work in the class-room every week, for which preparation is made in advance.

Latin is studied four years (with a daily exercise), and the following books are read: in the fourth class ('junior' year)—Caesar *B.G.* three books (II. III. IV.); in the third class ('junior middle' year)—Caesar *B.G.* three books (I., V., VI.), Sallust *Catiline*, Cicero *Leg. Man.*, Virgil *Aen.* I.; in the second class ('middle' year)—Virgil *Aen.* II.—VI., and *Eclogues*, Caesar reviewed; and in the fourth class ('senior' year), Cicero, five or six orations, and selections from Ovid, or from Livy and Horace (or from Cicero's essays). The first year is given to the grammar and exercises and the subsequent years to texts.

Greek is begun in the third class, and continued for three years (five hours weekly): the books read, not to specify the authors of selections in the Greek reader used in the third class, are Xenophon (*Anab.* I.—IV.), Homer (*Iliad*, maximum of six books, minimum of three books), Herodotus (selections,

bounty must provide. In a few of our states, however, state universities and colleges have been founded and are maintained by appropriations from the state treasury: these institutions are commonly schools of science and the arts and furnish also professional instruction.

¹ The policy of our local communities with reference to popular education is to provide instruction in the common English branches or the so-called practical subjects, free of expense, for all children; but not to go beyond this. For higher instruction, i.e. for the liberal education of limited numbers, private

amounting to one book), with short selections from Xenophon's *Hellenica* as a basis for prose composition.

In the study of both Greek and Roman writers constant attention is paid to history, mythology, biography, antiquities, geography, as well as to the languages themselves; there is much translation 'at sight' into English, as well as impromptu translation into Latin and Greek. Elementary composition in Greek and Latin prose is systematically taught in set exercises of simple narrative. There is no verse composition of any sort, either Greek or Latin. (In fact, instruction in Greek and Latin verse composition is not given at American schools and colleges, except in a very few sporadic cases.) The exercises in prose composition at school are exercises in grammar rather than in style, Greek and Roman history and classical geography are taught in the time of the Greek and Latin; very few hours are given to these subjects, and they are treated only in outline. The books and editions used are mainly American (Allen and Greenough's *Latin Grammar*, Goodwin's *Greek Grammar*, etc.); some of the English primers of literature, antiquities, and history have been adopted, as well as selections for unseen translation.

The requisitions for admission, in the classics, to many of our colleges are low enough to make it possible for students to omit the 'senior' year, and to enter the Freshman class in college, from the second class at school; but students who desire to enter Harvard or Yale on full standing must complete the four years' course.

This full course comprises, besides the subjects mentioned above: French and German,—each four hours weekly for one year ('senior' year); English composition, theme work with reading of authors prescribed by the colleges,—four hours weekly first year, one hour weekly through the other years; arithmetic, algebra, geometry, trigonometry (plane)—five hours weekly for three years; physics and chemistry (laboratory work)—six hours weekly for one year. Not all the work specified above is required of all students or even possible for all, at least so far as these subjects fall into the last year at school; options are offered according to the requisitions of various colleges, and the ability or proficiency of pupils.

There are no school-rooms, except for recitation purposes, as all preparations are made in the boys' own rooms; two-thirds of the boys (who number about 200 on the classical side, from all parts of the United States, though mainly from New England) live in private families, and one-third in commons, but all are under the supervision of the teachers. It is not common for masters to take boys into their own houses. Corporal punishment, detentions, 'lines,' etc., are unknown punishments in schools of this class. The school day begins with morning chapel at 8.10 o'clock, followed by lessons until 12.30 P.M.; lessons again from 2.30 P.M. to 4.30 P.M., and study-hour in the evening. The school sports are football, lawn-tennis, base-ball; in winter, skating and coasting between the hours of 4.30 P.M. and 6 P.M. on Wednesday and Saturday afternoons. The gymnasium is an important feature in an American school of this grade, and the apparatus is largely of the American fashion, intended to develop the body rather than for the encouragement of feats of strength and skill. The school is in the country, and out-door sports are supplemented by 'bonds.' On half-holidays the master 'calls absence,' as at Eton, at six or seven o'clock. On Sunday, services are twice held in the school chapel.

While there are many minor differences, it may safely be said that the spirit, aims, and methods of

the school described above are characteristic of the better preparatory schools in the United States. Accordingly, in order to give completeness to our sketch of secondary education for classical students, we now need only to comment upon a few points not already made clear. At school lessons are learned out of books, and 'recited' by the students, assembled in classes, to teachers, who often do little more than conduct a daily examination upon the text-book. Instruction in the form of systematic lectures forms no regular part of the school programme, and as a result students are often poorly prepared for the lecture methods which are in vogue in some of our colleges, at least in certain subjects.

Of late 'reading at sight' in Greek and Latin has been made much of in our schools, in great measure through the demand of the entrance examination papers of our leading colleges, where passages of average difficulty are set for translation from books not definitely prescribed for admission. By the expression 'reading at sight' is meant not only, or even principally, extempore renderings into English in the class-room of passages not previously seen, but also the oral or written translation made at home, with a generous allowance of time, without lexical or grammatical helps of any sort. This excellent practice, when accompanied by the careful and minute study of specified parts of the best classical writers, has greatly improved the range and quality of the scholarship of boys coming up to college.

The books and subjects with which the average boy is required to show a sufficient acquaintance in order to enter college as a Freshman and to satisfy the maximum requisitions for admission were named in my last letter (p. 79). In the classics his work will rarely have extended beyond the authors and matters named below, prescribed for entrance, and will commonly fall short of them. And with reference to the subjects, it should be noted that his knowledge of Greek and Roman history, as of history in general, will be extremely rudimentary, and that his Greek and Latin composition, not everywhere prescribed for admission to college, will call for little more than a familiarity with the more common forms and with the principal rules of syntax. In Latin he will have read four or five books of Caesar's *Gallie Wars*; six or seven orations of Cicero (preferably the *Catilinarian*, *pro Arch.*, etc.); six books of Virgil's *Aeneid*, with the *Eclogues*, and two or three thousand lines of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. In Greek he will have read three or four books of Xenophon's *Anabasis*, or an equivalent amount of Attic prose in a Reader (Goodwin's); three books of the *Iliad*, and occasionally a book of Herodotus. In some colleges at the entrance examination he will be required to translate not only from the books specified, but also at sight from other books by the same authors; in a few colleges this translation at sight takes the place of all quantitative requisitions, but in these cases the standard of work is high enough to make it necessary for the successful candidate to have read at least as much as is elsewhere prescribed, and sometimes more than this amount. Special papers in elementary Greek and Latin grammar are often, though not always, set at the examinations, and the candidate must show his familiarity with the language, subject-matter, history, antiquities, geography, etc., in the books and authors read. There are also papers on Greek and Latin prose composition, and on the outlines of Greek and Roman history. At the examination no helps of any sort (lexicons, grammars, etc.) are allowed.

In some of our colleges, especially in the west and south, the maximum requisitions for admission do not include Homer, Herodotus, Ovid, or such large quantities of the other authors as were mentioned

above: in these colleges instruction in the omitted books constitutes the work of Freshman year. The same remarks hold true of the minimum requisitions in some of the northern colleges.

In order to satisfy the requisition of admission to our colleges, and to reach the standard fixed by the better institutions, the candidate must have made considerable attainments in many subjects before leaving school: and, as a class, our Freshmen are a well-informed, alert, manly and independent set of young men. It must however be frankly admitted that the average American lad on leaving school, at the age of eighteen or nineteen, is by no means as far along in intellectual acquisitions and in the faculty for independent work in language and literature as are youths of the same age in some European countries, or as he might be under an improved system. At the Preparatory School an excessive amount of time is spent by pupils, under the age of fifteen, in a manner at once wearisome and wasteful, upon so-called practical subjects: if some of this time were given, under skilful instruction, to the practical mastery of the rudiments of Latin or Greek (or of French and German) the work of the Preparatory School would be distinctly enriched and strengthened, and that of the colleges, at least in these subjects, would begin on a higher level, and become more fruitful of good.

Each college fixes its own requisitions for admission, independently of all other colleges, and of course with no government supervision or interference whatever. There has, however, always been a general agreement on these matters, at least among the colleges of New England, and this general agreement has lately found expression in the establishment of an advisory board of representatives of the various colleges, known as the Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations, which makes recommendations upon matters of common interest, and aims to secure uniformity of action.

The principal teachers, or masters (sometimes officially designated 'professors,' as in many German gymnasia) in the older and better schools commonly hold permanent appointments, while subordinate teachers hold their positions from year to year. In the work of teaching, each master confines himself, as far as may be, to one subject or to a group of very closely related subjects (as to Greek, or to Latin; or to Greek History and Greek geography etc.): the custom which prevails in some schools in Germany of assigning all pupils of the same year or class to one master, or class-teacher, for all or for nearly all their studies, has gained no ground among us. In fact we have in many cases gone too far toward the other extreme, and are inclined to separate by too sharp a line subjects that are intimately connected; our teachers are disposed to specialize unduly in their work of teaching.

Of our classical teachers in the schools, no previous training or study of a professional character is required, and (except in the case of holders of certain positions in the 'high' schools in a few of our states) no examinations for teaching certificates are prescribed. Ordinarily, however, only college graduates (B.A.'s.) receive appointment. The competition for good positions in our better schools is increasing, and in some parts of the country public opinion begins to demand something of special, if not of professional, training for teachers. Our universities (in their 'graduate' departments) and some of our colleges have already made attempts to meet this demand. Another element of weakness in our system, which is, however, gradually being removed, is the custom of appointing as teachers young college graduates, who,

with no intention of remaining teachers, undertake the work only as a convenient way of earning money to meet their expenses in professional study for the bar, and for medicine. This practice, it is true, secures fresh blood in the teaching force, and brings into vital contact with our schools many young men who afterwards play an important and influential part in our social and public life, but both these advantages are secured distinctly at the expense of the permanent efficiency of our system, and the practice thwarts its best development.

The controversy between classical and the so-called modern studies for the place of honour in the education of youth is by no means unknown to us. The friends of classical studies are content to leave the issue of this contest to time, and its decision to the sober judgment of a people which is ever alert for the best things. But in this controversy classical studies are doomed to meet reverses and perhaps defeat, unless their efficiency and fruitfulness are maintained and increased. Upon the skill, learning, and devotion of the teachers in the classical schools of our country perhaps more depends than upon college or upon university instructors, for securing to large numbers of youth the incomparable benefits of sound classical training, if not for the advancement of classical learning. How important then that our teachers should be well equipped and well chosen for their work! The vigour and splendid reach of classical studies in Germany and their potency in the intellectual life of that country are in great part due to the admirable training to which teachers in the gymnasia have been subjected at the university, a training in independent philological study and research much more than in pedagogical methods. In a notable letter upon the value, object and essential features of the ideal *seminarium philologicum*, Ritschl says that if classical studies flourish in Germany more than in other lands, the cause is to be found nowhere else than in the philological seminaries of her universities, in which her classical teachers were disciplined. As an incidental proof of this statement he calls attention to the total revolution that had taken place in Austrian higher education within a generation. It was only within that period that seminaries and the methods of seminary training had been introduced into the Austrian universities, and the results of the changes were no less than the existence of an excellent corps of gymnasial teachers, and a reformed higher education, in which Austria at the time of writing was not behind her sister states. The greatest need of the higher education, he adds, is competent gymnasial teachers. The most pressing need in our educational system is perhaps just at this point. To be sure the colleges have already begun to insist upon a special professional preparation either, here or in Europe, in candidates for college positions, and the scholarly character and efficiency of our teaching force in the colleges has thereby been greatly improved. But this reform has not yet reached down into the schools, where it is most needed. When our school boards shall insist upon the qualification of high and independent scholarship with that of pedagogic skill for positions within their gift, the presence, in the corps of instruction of our secondary schools, of men distinguished for productive and creative scholarship will cease to be a brilliant exception, and classical studies will secure a popularity and recognition hitherto unknown and perhaps never anticipated.

J. H. WRIGHT.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
April 2, 1889.

OBITUARY.

DR. KENNEDY.

BENJAMIN HALL KENNEDY, eldest son of the Rev. Rann Kennedy, was born at Summer Hill, near Birmingham, November 6, 1804. His father was intimate at Cambridge (B.A. of St. John's, 1795, M.A. 1798) with S. T. Coleridge, and was appointed second master of King Edward's school, Birmingham, in 1807, an office which he resigned more than twenty years before his death (ob. 2 Jan., 1851, æt. 79). For twenty years he was curate, and afterwards incumbent, of St. Paul's church, Birmingham. The first edition of *Between Whiles* (1877) contains poems by Mr. Rann Kennedy, and an Appendix, giving a character of him by a friend, much of which would apply without alteration to his more famous son.

A leading trait in Mr. Kennedy's character was simplicity, . . . a perfect transparency of soul, combined with a childlike spontaneous freshness of feeling, subduing the power of his intellect and the extent of his acquirements, and investing his nature with the beauty of perpetual youth. . . . Enthusiasm was allied with this singleness of mind. By enthusiasm I mean an energy and warmth and earnestness, inducing activity and vigour in every pursuit which interested him. I believe he was incapable of entertaining the question whether he should devote much or little attention to his favourite objects. Earnestness was a law of his nature, and one which he found it pleasant to obey. . . .

Mr. Kennedy possessed a remarkable power of expression. In voice, in countenance, in action, when he was moved, every utterance and feature and gesture was eloquent. He was the finest reader and reciter of poetry that I ever heard. . . .

Though destitute of anything approaching to sickly sentimentality, his natural affections were deep and powerful. . . .

His exquisite taste was a constant source of pleasure to himself and his friends. . . .

Perhaps the most attractive trait in Mr. Kennedy's character was his largeness of heart, his world-wide charity and liberality. This feeling was beautifully exemplified towards those who differed from him in politics and religion, and this at a period when unhappily such charity was not deemed quite orthodox. From the same feeling, combined with enlightened views of social interests, sprang his consistent advocacy of education when the prejudices of society were too generally arrayed against the diffusion of knowledge. . . . It was no part of his creed to infringe the laws of Christian courtesy and kindness in vindicating Christian principles. . . .

In conversing on the distinguishing truths of Christianity, Mr. Kennedy used to speak of them with entire simplicity of belief as accomplished facts. . . .

A lady thus describes Mr. Kennedy's command of the English poets :

I think I see him now, tall, dark, impassioned, unconscious of the flight of time, while he poured forth passage after passage with kindling eyes, appearing to know all the poets and their creations as if they were members of his own family, and defending or explaining them with a fulness of enthusiasm which I never saw equalled.

Add to this that Welsh, Scotch, and French blood all ran in Dr. Kennedy's veins, and you will read in some measure the secret of his unfailing vivacity and quickness of thought and speech.

Benjamin for a time went to Birmingham school, but received, as his brothers after him, his chief training under Dr. Samuel Butler at Shrewsbury—an admirable master, whose life and correspondence, edited by his grandson, may be expected before long.

In the second edition (1882) of *Between Whiles* we have a graphic picture of this period. The late Master of Trinity, speaking of the chief composers of our time, once said to me: 'Kennedy is an original Latin poet.' And certainly he sought inspiration for his *lusus subdiales*, where Wordsworth did; the ease and grace of his versions is redolent of the country side rather than of midnight oil. Few composers could venture to intermit practice for many years together, as our hero did; many of us can only compose with a pen in our hand.

Even in my schoolboy life, it was only in desperate cases, when inspiration would not come, that I sat down to scribble a verse exercise. If I liked the subject given, I relied on the meditation of a solitary walk, and took paper afterwards only to transcribe what was already written at full in the tablets of the mind. I became a Praepostor of Shrewsbury School in my second term there, and thus I had the great advantage of classical composition under a wise Head Master and an emulative system during four years, before I went to Cambridge. Praepostors, in their week of office (once a month), had to present a Greek verse exercise, usually a self-chosen translation of extra length, in place of all other exercises. A subject was given out with 'hints,' every Tuesday, to the Sixth Form, on which two Latin verse exercises were required, one elegiac, the other lyric. But a Praepostor was allowed to substitute heroic for elegiac verse, and for the second exercise a Latin verse translation of a Greek Chorus, or a Greek verse translation from an English dramatist (usually Shakespeare). The choice of such Chorus or passage was left to ourselves, and there was an honourable understanding that the work was our own. This led me to form a little stock of choral lyrics and Greek iambic translations, as a convenient resource when an untoward subject or a lazy mood

dissuaded me from attempting original Alcaics. And I have no doubt this practice, whatever its primary motive, was favourable to my general improvement in scholarship. And thus the licence allowed by Dr. Butler was shown to be a very wise one.

When I went to College in 1823, being freed from the necessity of verse-writing—a yoke beneficial, but sometimes galling, to a schoolboy studying Classics—I wrote no verse as an undergraduate, except for a few prizes, or in examinations.

He would often, in later years, spur his pupils to emulation, by telling us what he had read before he went to college, and it sounded like the record of a Scaliger. His unexampled career of success as an undergraduate was achieved in great part with the stores accumulated at Shrewsbury. If the list did not include the Bell scholarship, it was only because Dr. Butler forbade him to compete, holding that the Pitt Scholar could not extend his fame by winning a prize in a limited field. At college, as always, Kennedy intensely enjoyed the society of kindred spirits, *Socraticos sermones*, and the Cambridge of his time was rich in such spirits; he took a leading part in the debates at the Union, and in 1824, as a freshman, was one of the original members of the Athenaeum club; he revelled over a wide range of modern literature, especially poetry and history, which was always a favorite topic. Few members of the united services could have vied with him in familiarity with naval and military annals. In Wellington's despatches he was as much at home as in Thucydides. So it came to pass that he by no means lived the life of a book-worm; probably in the whole year there was no one whose degree cost less of special effort than his who was—in every sense—*facile princeps*. Biographers will find in the correspondence of the time, e.g. in Dr. Parr's works, what a harvest the weatherwise prognosticated from that bright spring.

After taking his degree Kennedy for a time resided in Cambridge. Among his pupils were the Senior and second wranglers of 1829, the present Bishop of Worcester and the Chancellor of Cambridge and two other Universities. In 1827 the first joint reading-party went for the long vacation to Devonshire, and certainly two more distinguished teachers never entered into

partnership, Hopkins and Kennedy. One day one of them (A) called on the other (B) to suggest that one of their pupils should confine himself to A's subjects, as he would probably be Senior in the tripos. B. retorted 'I was just coming to you, to suggest that he should give up *your* subjects.' It is to be presumed that Mathematics prevailed in the friendly altercation; for the disputed pupil, Henry Philpott, led the van of the Mathematical, but brought up the rear of the first class in the Classical tripos. For one year Kennedy went as an assistant master to Shrewsbury school. In 1830 he accepted a mastership at Harrow under Dr. Longley, afterwards first Bishop of Ripon, then successively Bishop of Durham, and Archbishop of York and Canterbury.

In March, 1831, Mr. Kennedy married, and every one who knew Mrs. Kennedy will testify that her gentle influence contributed powerfully, not only to the happiness of his home—and never was a happier home—but to the success of his public life. Mrs. Kennedy died in 1874, and lies in the Mill Road cemetery, Cambridge, where her husband was laid by her side on the 12th of April, 1889. Four daughters survive; the only son died before his father, leaving a widow with one son and three daughters. Only those who have seen Dr. Kennedy with children can appreciate his playfulness and native simplicity. In this, and in other respects, he resembled another honorary fellow of his college, Churchill Babington, who died a few weeks before him; it would be hard to say which of the two took greater interest in the ancient classics, though from different points of view: the older man from that of the poet and orator, the younger from that of the antiquary. Beauty was the mistress of the one, Knowledge of the other.

In 1836 Kennedy succeeded his old master, Dr. Butler, as head master of Shrewsbury. In that year he became D.D. by royal mandate, being, perhaps, the youngest Doctor of Divinity in his university; when he died, fifty-three years later, he was the senior of his faculty.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

(To be continued.)

ARCHAEOLOGY.

ROMAN INSCRIPTIONS FROM SARDINIA.

THE following inscriptions have been sent to the editor of the *Classical Review* by Signor Tamponi, an industrious and enthusiastic archaeologist resident at Terranova in the north of Sardinia. They are meant, he says, *come una prova di simpatia e di stima verso di letterati inglesi*. English readers will, I think, appreciate Signor Tamponi's goodwill and kindness, as well as the interesting and important inscriptions which he has sent. In printing them I have added a few notes and supplements. The latter, some of which had been already suggested by Signor Tamponi, are intended simply to make the inscriptions more intelligible to ordinary readers. The expansion of the naval inscription has, I understand, Mommsen's authority.

The ancient Olbia, in or near which the inscriptions were found, was a seaport town of considerable importance in the time of Cicero. Several objects of interest have been found in its necropolis, and the remains of a Roman aqueduct are still to be seen in the vicinity. Signor Tamponi, who is Royal Inspector of Excavations for this district, has in the last few years made out the walls, the *thermae*, and other interesting ruins belonging to the ancient town.

F. HAVERFIELD.

I.—TOMBSTONES.

1. 68 inches high, 20 broad, 12 thick, weighing about 1550 pounds: *now in the garden Tamponi in Terranova*.

AVRELIO
EXLSAL.
AVGVSTA
AN. LX. ST.
XXX. HES



Altogether there were found forty-nine inscriptions, more or less legible, and a quantity of wholly undecipherable stones, all of them hewn out of the local granite. They seem to have been found in batches, as

*Aurelio ex liburna) Sal(via) Augusta an-
(norum) ex, st(ipendiorum) xxx: h(ic) e(st) s(itus).*
The felucca *Salvia Augusta* no doubt belonged to the fleet of Misenum. The men and officers of this fleet are commemorated in a vast number of inscriptions, which have been collected by Mommsen, *C.I.L.*, x. p. 316f., and which comprise over seventy ships' names, e.g. *Apollo*, *Cupido*, *Pax*, *Iustitia*, *Salus*, *Diomedes*, *Tigris*, *Euphrates*, *Taurus*. The above is a typical monument of an ordinary sailor. The use of *ex* (*ex navi, ex liburna, &c.*) is regular on naval inscriptions, but otherwise rare. (*Eph. Epigr.* 5, 128.)

2. FVLVILA
VALENTI . F
ANNOR
XIX . H . S . E .

3. PERTIVS
CVRSI . F
ANN . XXV
H . S . E .

Cursius Costini fil. *C.I.L.* x. 7981.

II.—MILESTONES, ETC. (A.D. 245—375.)

The following inscriptions were recently found by Signor Tamponi near *Terranova* along the course of the Roman road which ran from Olbia (*Terranova*) to Carales (*Cagliari*), a distance, according to the Antonine Itinerary, of 173 miles. The exact situation will be plain from the following plan, the whole length being about twelve and a half miles:—

is not uncommonly the case: Mr. Clayton found five together three years ago near the Roman Wall at Chesterholm. The reason, no doubt, is that a fresh inscription was often cut for a new Emperor. The inscrip-

tions have all been published in the *Notizie degli Scavi* by Signor Tamponi (August 1888, pp. 535—553), but the *Notizie* are very little read in England and the discovery is a remarkable one. I have taken from the *Notizie* the details of size and locality, and have noted certain differences between the texts in the *Notizie* and those sent to the *Review*. Unless otherwise stated, I have printed the latter exactly. The numerals in square brackets show the numbering in the *Notizie*.

The inscriptions consist, when perfect, of three parts:—

(1) the distance *m(illia) p(assuum)* In many of the following, part of the numeral has been lost.

(2) the names of the Emperors, under whom the stone was erected, usually so given that the stone is a dedication as well as a milestone. The regular order of the titles in the third century is *Imp(erator) Caesar* *p(ius) f(elix) inv(ictus) Aug(ustus) p(ontifex) m(aximus) trib(unicia) pot(estate), cos(consul) p(ater) patriae proco(n)s(ul)*, but variations were common in the third century. *D(ominus) n(oster)*, which first appears about A.D. 194, is usually placed before or instead of *Imp. Caes.* after Diocletian, and titles like *restitutor orbis* are introduced with much freedom after the same date. The titulature differs from that of the early Emperors chiefly in the use of *Imp. Caesar*, of *p. f. inv.* (permanent since A.D. 220) and of *procos.*

(3) the name of the governor of Sardinia, with his title. From 200—293 this title was *proc(urator)* or *proc. et praefectus prov(inciae)* or *praes(es)*. As the governor was thus an *eques*, *v(ir) e(gregius)* or *v(ir) p(erfectissimus)* are often added. After 293, the title is *praeses*.

It should be added that some of the inscriptions may be mere dedications (e.g. 22): the difference is in many cases very small.

1. [1] *Pedra Zoccada*, 88 in. high, 54 in. in circumference.

M . P . CLXIII
IMP . CAES . M . IVLIVS
PHILIPPVS
PIVS . FELIX . AVG
5 PONTIFEX . MAX . TRIB
P . II . P . P . PROC . COS . VIA (A.D. 245)
QVE . ADDVCET . A . KARA
LIBVS . OLVIE . SVE . VETVS
TATE . CORRVP(T)A . RES
10 TITVIT . CVRANTE
 IN
 IVS V E

2, 3. C . IVLIVS VERVS MAXIMIVS *Not.* The difference of reading is somewhat great. Philippus was consul and trib. pot ii. in 245, Maximinus I. consul and trib. pot ii. in 236. 7. *adducet* = *adducit*. Exx. of *e* for *i* are common, cf. Seelmann, *Aussprache*, pp. 200—202, who gives a list; Varro *rust.* i. 2, 14; Quint. i. 4, 17.

Ulpius Victor was procurator under Philip-pus (*C.I.L.* x. 7946, 8027), but no conjecture can be made safely here.

2. [8] *Sbrangatu*, 51 in. high, 53 in. in circumference.

M . P . CLXX
IMPP . IVLIO . PHILIPPO . PIO . FELICI
PONT . MAXIMO . TRIB . POTESTAT
COS . P . P . PROCONS . ET (A.D. 247)
5 IMP . CAES . M . IVLIO . PHILIPPO . P . P .
PONT . MAXIMO . TRIB . POTESTAT
COS . P . P . PROCONS . *viam* QVE . DVCET
a KARALIBVS . OLBIAE . VETVSTATE *corr*
uptam rest ITVIT . CVRANTE
10 PVBLIO . VALENTE . PROC . SVO .
 S . C



10. PVLIO *Tam.*

The double *pontifices maximi* begin with Pupienus and Balbinus in 238 A.D. Valens is otherwise unknown.

3. [7] *Sbrangatu*, 42 in. high, 59 in. in circumference.

M . P . CLXX
D . D . N . N . IMPP . SANCTISSIMI C BI (A.D. 251)
BIVS . TREBONIANVS . GALLVS . PIVS . *Fel* .
INVICTVS . AVG . ET . L . BIB
5 IVS . AFINIVS . VELDVMIANVS
VOLVSIANVS . PIVS . FELIX . INVICTVS *aug.*
VIAM . QVE . A . KARALIBVS . OLBIAE
ducit . VETVSTATE . CONSVN *ptam*
restitverunt . CVRANTE . ET . DEDICANTE
10 ANTONIO . SEPTIMIO . HERACLITO
 V . E . PROC . SVO .



2. ETBIS *Not.* 4. L . BIB om. *Not.*
B for v in 2 and 4. The 'error' is a common one from the end of second century onwards, Seelman, *Aussprache*, p. 239;
q 2

Jordan, *Beiträge*, p. 51. N for M in 8, Seelmann, p. 276.

Septimius is otherwise unknown.

4. [16] *Sbrangatu*, 63 in. high, 62 in. in circumference.

M . P . C . . .

IMP . CAES . M . AEMILIO Aemiliano

PIO . FELICI . INVICTO *aug p m*

TRIB . POT . P . P . P . RROCOS . *viam quae*

ducta . KARALIS . OLBIAE . *vetusta*

te CONSVPTA . *restituente*

ET . DEDICANTE M Calpurnio

CAELIANO

V . E . PROC . SVO .



Aemilius was acknowledged by the senate in A.D. 253, and overthrown three months later. An inser. almost identical with this one was found at Sbrangatu by Signor Tamponi (*Not.* No. 13), see No. 22.

For Caelianus see Klein, *Verwaltungsbeamte*, p. 277. C. x. 8011, 8012, 8033.

5. [11] *Sbrangatu*, 65 in. high, 57 in. in circumference.

M . P . CLX

IMP . CAESAR . P . LICINIO

VALERIANO . PONTIFICI

MAXIMO . TRIB . POT . COS . *p. p. procos*

5 et IMP . CAESAR . *p.* LICINIO *ga*

LLIENO . PIO . FELICI . AVG . *Pont. max.*

tribunicia POT . *cos* PROCOS . *VIAM quae*

DVCIT . A . KARALIBVS . OLVIAE . *VETVstate*

CORRVPTA . RESTITVRVNT . CVRANTE

10 m . CALPVENIO . CAELIANO

PROC . SVO .

1. CX. *Tam.*

2. C. P. LIC. *Not.* 5. CAESAR . LICINIO . P . GA *Not.* *Imp. C. P. Lic. Valerianus* is common on coins, and Cohen (5, p. 300 foll.) expands *Caius Publius* but it is more naturally *Caes. &c.* Double praenomina do sometimes occur together, e.g. *L. P. Septimius Geta* (C. iii. 1174 and p. 1116).

6. [37] *Lipparaggia*, 54 in. high, 58 in. in circumference.

et P . Licinio

CORNELIO . SALONINO . *Val. nob.*

CAES . AVGVSTVS . *viam cet.*

OLBIE . VETVSTATE . *corrupta*

5 CVRANTE . CAELIANO

v E . P . SARDINIAE

PROC . SVO

1. II. *Not.*

The conclusion of an inser. which commemorated probably Valerian and Gallienus as well as Saloninus. Cp. an inser. found on the same road, Orelli-Henzen 5544 = *C.I.L.* x. 8028. Both the sons of Gallienus were granted the title *Augustus* while their father lived, to show their share in governing.

7. [4] *Oddastru*, quadrangular stone, 60 in. high, 20 broad, 16 thick.

P . CLX

D . N . IMP . CAES

VALERIVS . LICINIO

VALERIANO

5 PIVS . FELIX . INVICTO

AVG . P . MAXIM

VS . TRIB . P . P . P . PRO (A.D. 253/60)

COS . VIA . QVE . DVCIT

a KARALIBVS . OLBIAE

10 BETVSTATE . CONSV

MPTA . RESTITVENTE

L . MESSIO . RVS

TICO . V . P . PRESI

DE . PROVINCIAE

15 SARDINIAE

S . C .

12. MES/////IORV. 13. SICO *Not.*

Valerian appears never to be called *Valerius Licinius*: it is probably a mistake for *P. Licinius*. Such mistakes are not uncommon.

Messius is otherwise unknown.

8. [22b] *Traisoli*, 62 in. high, 56 in. in circumference.

M . P . CLXVIII

D . D . D . N . N . N .

IMP . CAES . P . LICINIO . VALERIANO

INBICTO . AVG . PONTIFICI . *max.*

5 GERMANICO . MAXIMO . TRIBUNICIAE

POTESTATI . V . COS . III . PATER . P . et

IMP . CAES . P . LICINIO . EGNATIO . *gallieno*

PIO . FELICI . INBICTO . AVG . PONT .

MAXIMO . GERMANICO . MAX . *trib*

10 POTESTATI . IIII . COS . III . PATRI . P . et

p . CORNELIO . EGNATIO . VALERIANO

NOBILISSIMO . CAES . PRINCIPI *iuventutis*,

VIA . QVAE . DVCIT . A . KRALIBVS . *olbiae*

CORRVPTA . RES . TTT . CVRANTE

15 MARIDIO . MARIDIANO

E . V . PROC . SVO .

12. PRINCIPIV *Not.* 14. Read restituit.

The year is 256 or 257, but the dates in many inscriptions of this unhappy time do not agree. Strictly speaking in 256 Valerian was tr. p. iv. cos iii., Gallienus tr. p. iv. cos

ii., and in 257 Valerian was tr. p. v., cos iv., Gallienus tr. p. v. cos iii. Similar errors appear on coins, Eckhel vii. pp. 377, 391.

e. 11. Neither son of Gallienus is known to have been called *Egnatius*, except perhaps on one Samian coin, and the various members of the family are so confused that it is not quite certain to whom the coin refers.

Maridius is otherwise unknown.

9. [2] *Pedra Zoccada*, 28 in. high, 14 broad, 8 thick.

M. CL
D. N. IMP
LVCIO . Domitio
AVRELIANO P. F.

5 INVICTO

AVG. PONTEFICI . MAXIMO
TRIBVNICIE . POT. VIAM quae (A.D. 270)
DVCIT . A. KARALIB . OLBIAE
VETVSTATE . CORRVPТА

10 RESTITVENTE

ET . CVRANTE
SEPTIMIO
NICRINO . V. P.
PROC. SVO
S. C.

15

6. PONTIFICI *Not*, but *pontefici* is prob. right. See No. 1. 13. v. P., om *Tam*.

Nicrinus is otherwise unknown.

11. [21] *Sbrangatu*, 64 in. high, 61 in. in circumference.

M. P. CLXVIII
D. N. IMP. CAES. M. AVRELIO . CARO pio (A.D. 282)
FELICI . INV. AVG. P. M. TRIB. POT. P. P. PROCOS
viam QVAE . DVCET . A. KARALIBVS . OLVIE
5 vetustate . CORRVPТА . RESTITVENTE
IVLIO . ///////////////NO . V. E. PRES . PROV. SARD .
S. C.

12. [24] *Roti li pioni*, 52 in. high, 66 in. in circumference.

M. P. CLXV
IMP . M. AVRELIO . CARO (A.D. 283)
PIO . FEL . AVG . ET . IMP . CAES . M. AVREL . CARINO
P. F. aug . PONTIF . MAX . TRIBVNIC . POTESTATIS
. viam quae ducit cet . vetustate
5 corrupta

3. PFI. /// *Not*. 5. om *Not*.

Carinus received the trib. pot. while his father Carus lived; hence he is styled IMP. CAESAR (as on his coins), and AVGVSTVS, and sometimes PROCOS. Cp. Mommsen *Staatsrecht*, ii. 1106 (ed. 2).

13. [27] *Traissoli*, 60 in. high.

M. P. C
M. AVRELIVS
CARINVS . Nobilissimus A.D. 282
CAES . VIA . QVE

10. [17] *Sbrangatu*, 48 in. high, 44 in. in circumference, inscribed on two sides.

(a) M. P. CLX
IMP . CAES . L. DOMI
TIVS . AVRE
LIANVS . PIVS . FE
5 LIX . INVICTVS .
AVG . P. M. TRIB . POT . cos
procos . VIAM . quae (A.D. 270)
DVCET . A. KARALIBVS
OLBIAE . VETVstate
10 CORRVPТА . RESTITU
IT . CVR . SEPTIMIO
NECRINO . V. E .
PROC . SVO .

2, 3. DOMITIVS *Not*.

(b) IXV
MP
conservatoresVRbis (?)
ETER
5 IMP

The second inscription clearly belongs to the period after Diocletian. The practice of using again old milestones was exceedingly common, and explains the comparative paucity of the earlier inscriptions, which were often erased. In other cases, as here and No. 22, the stone was simply reversed.

5 DVCIT . A. KARALIBVS
OLBIA . VET . CORRVPТА
restitvit curante
M. AELIO
VITALE . V. P .
PRAES . PROV .
SARD .

1, 2. MIMP . CAES/M . AVRELIVS *Not*, probably rightly, cp. No. 12. 7. RESTITVIT *Not*.

For Vitalis cp. Klein, p. 283, C. x. 8013.

14. [12] *Sbrangatu*, 68 in. high, 57 in. in circumference.

M. P. C
 d. D. D. D. N. N. N. N. n.
 IMPP. CAES. C. VALERIO (A.D. 293-305)
 DIOCLETIANO. ET. M. AVRELIO. VALERIO
 5 MAXSIMIANO. P. F. INVICTIS. AVGG
 ET. FLAVIO. VALERIO. COSTANTIO. ET
 GALERIO. VALERIO. MAXSIMIANO
 NOBILISSIMIS. CAESARIBVS. VIA
 QVE. DVC. A. KARAL. OLBI. CVRANTE
 10 AVRELIO. MARCO. V. P. PRESES. PROV. SARD.
 S. C.

2. om. N. N. N. 5. om. INVICTIS (but a space left) *Not.* 6, 7. Tamponi gives one line, T. FLAVIO. VALERIO. MAXSIMIANO.

Constantius Chlorus and Galerius became Caesars in 293; Diocletian and Maximian abdicated in 305. cos- for cons- and xs for x are obvious and common variations.

Aurelius seems otherwise unknown.

15. [5] *Sbrangatu*, 74 in. high, 56 in. in circumference.

M. p.
 D. D. D. D. N. N. N. N. N.
 IMPP. CAES. C. Val Diocletiano
 ET. M. AVRELIO Val. Maximiano
 5 P. P. FE. INVICTI. AVG. et Fl. Valeri
 O. COSTANTIO. ET. Galerio
 Val. MAXIMIANO. AVG.
 CAESARIBVS. VIA. QVE ducit
 a KARAL. OLBI. CVRANTE
 10 AVRELIO. MARCO
 PRESES. PROV. SARD
 S. C.

3. om. C. 4. AVRELI////E, *Not.* 12. S. C. omit *Tam.*

Constantius Chlorus and Galerius became *Augusti* when Diocletian and Maximian Herculius abdicated. The AVG in line 7 is therefore, probably, an error.

16. [29] *Roti li Pioni*, 66 in. high.

VAL
 IO DI
 ANO
 PIMPGA
 5 PF INVI
 PON TR
 AX
 PROT
 VAL FL
 10 NVS VI
 P DVF
 EOR

Possibly [*Imp. Caes. C*] *Val[eri]o Di[ocleti]-*
ano [et] imp [C]a[es] M. Aur. Maximiano] p.
f. invi[et] po[t] tr[ib]. p. m]ax [cos] pro[cos]

*Val. Fl[avia]nus vi[r] p[er]fectissimus d(eo-
 tus) [n(umini) m(aiestatique) eor(um)].* This presupposes that letters have been read read wrong in vv. 5, 8 and 10, and, even so, is not wholly satisfactory. The formula D. N. M. E is common at the end of inscriptions of this kind and date.

17. [6] *Sbrangatu*, quadrangular stone, 72 in. high, 23 broad, 12 thick.

TOTIVS. Orbis restitutoribus(?)
 IMP. P. CAES
 VALERIO. Constantino
 P. F. INVICT. AVG.
 5 trib. POT. P. P. PROC et (A.D. 306-7)
 m. AVRELIO. VALERIO Maxentio
 P. F. INVICTO. AVG.
 P. P. PROCOS. VIA
 VETVSTATE. corrupta
 10 CVRANTE
 MAXIMIN(?)
 VS. PRESES
 PROV. SARD
 S. C.

1. TVTIVS. 11. MAXIMII *Not.* 14. S. C. om. *Tam.*

Constantine I. and Maxentius hardly suit one another, but the order prevents any other expansion. In v. 2 IMP. P = IMPP.

18. [9] *Sbrangatu*, 64 in. high, 22 in. broad, 16 thick.

M. P. CL
 IMP. P. CAESAR
 MARC. VALERIO (A.D. 306-12)
 MAXENTIO. P. F
 5 INVICTO. AVG. ET
 ROMVLO. NOBILIS
 SIMO. VIRO. VIA. QVE
 DVCET. A. KARALIBVS
 OLBI. CVRANTE. Z.
 10 CORNIELIO sic
 FORTVNATIANO
 PRES. PROBINC
 SARDINIE

Romulus was son to Maxentius. The *praeses* L. Cornelius is mentioned (with the title v. e) also on fragment found at *Lipparaggia* (No. 41 *Notizie*). He is otherwise unknown.

19. [20] *Sbrangatu*, quadrangular stone, 57 in. high, 20 broad, 12 thick.

M. P. CLXVIII
D. N. VAL. LICINIANO
LICINIO
PIO. FELICI. INVICT
5 HAC. PERFETVO *sic*
SEMPER. AVG
DED. T. SEPTIMIO
IANNVARIO. V. C. *sic*
P. P. SARD. D. N. M. E.

2. LICINI. AVG *Not.*

5. HAC = ac. *C.I.L.* vii. 1002, Seelmann, *Aussprache*, p. 266.

7. DED = *dedicante*.

9. P. P. = *p(reses) p(rovinciae)*.

9. D. N. M. E. see No. 16.

Licinius the elder (307—323) ruled first Illyricum; after 311 he added Greece Macedonia and Thrace, after 313 the East. But he does not seem to have ruled Sardinia. For Ianuarius, see *C. x.* 7950, 7974, 7975.

20. [42] *Telti*, quadrangular stone, 34 in. high, 17 broad, 8 thick.

D. N. FL. DEL
MATIO. NOB
AC. FORTISSIMO (A.D. 335—337)
QVE. CAES. D. N
5 M. QVE EIVS
PON. MAX. TRIB
POTES. P. P. P. AG
HELENNVS. V P *sic*
PROC

4, 5. *d(evotus) n(umini) m(aiestati)que eius*.

Delmatius and Hannibalianus were granted a share in the empire by the the will of Constantine the Great, Delmatius receiving Thrace, Macedonia, and Achaia. But they were put to death at once (A.D. 337), so that vv. 6—10 can hardly belong to the first part of the inscr. Delmatius held the title of Caesar 335—337 A.D. Nothing is known of Helennus. In v. 7, P. P. P. AG may be *P(ius) [F](elix) P(erpetuus) A(u)g(ustus)*.

21. [15] *Sbrangatu*, quadrangular stone, 48 in. high, 16 broad, 14 thick.

D. N.
FL. CL. CO
NSTANTI
NO. VICTO (A.D. 337—40)

5 RI. SEMPE
R. AVG. CV
RANTE. M
VNATIO. G
ENTEANO.
10 V. P. PRESI
DE. PROVI
NCIAE. SAR
DINIAE

M P V

8, 9. D[INTIANO] *Not.* 14. v om. *Not.*

The Constantine meant is Constantine II. The governor's name is otherwise unknown.

22. [13] *Sbrangatu*, cylindrical block, 49 in. high, 53 in. in circumference, inscribed on two sides (see No. 4): in large letters.

M
SALBOS. DDNN
VALENTINIANO (A.D. 364—375)
ETVALENTI *sic*
5 AVGG. BONO. REIPV
BLICE. NATIS. ADPP
MAXIMINS VPPPS
CVRABIT

7. VPPIS *Not.*

B = v in 2 and 8. VPPPS = *vir perfectissimus praeses prov. Sard.* *Cp. C. x.* 8026, Fl. Maximinus under Valentinian: that inscription is, however, partly corrupt.

23. [19] *Sbrangatu*, 64 in high, 28 in. in circumference.

M. P. C
IMP. CA
.....
TI
5 VESPA
VIAM. QVE
VETVSTA
CVRANTE
PROC. V. E.

4. TII *Not.*

5. Read possibly *trib. po]testate*. Signor Tamponi supplies *Imp Caesar aug. Domi]ti[anus divi] Vespa[siani] f. cet.* and hence infers that Sardinia was governed by procurators under Domitian. This supplement is improbable. (1) *Imp. Caesar* is unusual in the first century (Mommson *Staatsrecht*, ii. 746). (2) The order of Domitian's titles is unparalleled (as he himself admits). (3) The title v. e. is unknown till 200 A.D. (Hirschfeld, *Verwaltungsgeschichte*, p. 273, Cagnat, *Epigr.* p. 80). If VESPA is really right the Emperor must be Titus (as a *pis aller*), and vv. 8, 9 must have been added by a later hand, as is the case with *C.I.L. x.*

8023 and 8024, where a later *procurator* has undeniably added his name to an inscr. of Vespasian.

The province of Sardinia was given over to the Senate by Nero in A.D. 66, and it has been usually held that Vespasian restored procuratorial government in or about A.D. 71 (Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung*, i. p. 249). This is indeed the view maintained even in the latest books, such as Liebenam's *Verwal-*

tungsgeschichte, p. 355, and Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*. It has, however, been conclusively shown by Mommsen that the evidence for this is bad, and that Sardinia remained under proconsuls till Commodus, or—if we neglect a dubious passage in Hippolytus—till Severus. Procurators continued till Diocletian introduced *praesides*.

F. HAVERFIELD.

INSCRIPTIONS FROM THEANGELA.

IN the March number of this *Review* (p. 139) Mr. Cecil Smith was able to announce Mr. W. R. Paton's discovery of the site of the ancient Carian town of Theangela. Mention was then made of certain inscriptions from the site, the originals of which are now understood to be in the possession of Dr. Fröhner. It is much to be desired that these documents should be duly edited from the marbles; but, as their publication seems to be delayed, it may be worth while to print the inscriptions from the copies which have come into my hands.

They were forwarded to me in the autumn of 1888 by Mr. Theodore Bent, who had come into possession of them in the following manner. In the month of May, 1887, a Greek agent was employed by him to make some excavations in the neighbourhood of Syme. This man, when at Datcha,

was informed by another agent living there, that 'on a site in the gulf of Cos' had been discovered a number of inscribed marbles and other antiquities, the inscriptions revealing the name of the site to be Theangela. Mr. Bent's agent then transcribed the three following inscriptions from the site in question, and forwarded the copies to Mr. Bent. He was informed that Nos. 1 and 2 had been already published in Paris, but No. 3 was still unpublished. Herein he seems to be mistaken. No. 3 was printed from an impression, with the omission of the first three lines, in the *Hellenic Journal* for 1885 (vol. vi. p. 251): the editor had no clue to its locality. The other two documents I have not yet seen in print. The copies seem to be sound and trustworthy, though with obvious clerical errors. The forms of the letters also are not carefully given.

1.

ΒΟΥΛΑΙΚΑΙΤΩ, ΔΑΜΩ, ΕΠΑΙΝΗΣΑΙ ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙ ΔΗΝΝΕΩΝ
 ΟΣΘΕ ΑΓΓΕΛΗ ΚΑΙ ΣΤΕΦΑΝΩ ΣΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΧΡΥΣΕΩ ΣΤΕΦΑΝΩ Α
 ΡΕΤΑΣ ΕΝΕΚΑ ΚΑΙ ΕΥΝΟΙΑΣ ΤΑΣ ΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ ΔΑΜΟΝΤΟΝ ΤΡΟΑ
 ΝΙΟΝ ΑΓΡΑΨΑΙ ΔΕ ΤΟΥ . . ΑΦΙΣΜΑ ΕΝ ΣΤΑΛΑΔΥΣΙΝ ΚΑΙΑΝ
 5 ΘΕΜΕΝΤΑ ΜΕΝΕΣ ΤΟΥ ΑΡΟΝΤΟΥ . . . ΑΠΟΛΛΟΝΟΣ
 ΤΟΥ ΘΕΑΡΙΟΥ ΤΑΝ ΔΕ ΕΝΘΕ ΑΓΓΕΛΟΙΣ ΕΙΣ ΤΟΙΑΡΟΝ ΤΑΣ
 ΑΘΑΝΑ ΠΤΑΝ ΔΕ ΒΟΥΛΑΝ ΤΑΝ ΥΠΟΥΡΓΙΑΝ ΠΑΡΕΧΕΝΑΝ
 ΔΡΑΣΕΛΕΣ ΘΑΙΟΙΤΙΝΕΣ ΤΟΥ ΤΩΝ ΕΠΙΜΕΛΗΣΟΝΤΑΙ ΑΒΟΥ
 10 ΛΑΙ ΠΕ ΑΙΡΕΘΕΝΟΙ ΠΕΝΤΕ ΕΠΙ ΤΑΝ ΣΤΑΛΑΝ ΤΑΝ ΕΝΟΙΑΓΓΕ
 ΛΟΙΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙ ΔΗΣ.

. . . . [ἀγαθὰ τύχη δεδόχθαι τῶ]

βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δάμῳ ἐπαιν(έ)σαι Ἀριστείδην Νέων-
 ος Θεαγγελῇ καὶ στεφανῶσαι αὐτὸν χρυσέῳ στεφάνῳ ἁ-
 ρετῶς ἐνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας τῆς εἰς τὸν δάμον τὸν Τρο[ξ]α-
 νί(ω)ν, ἀ[να]γράψαι δὲ τὸ (ψ)άφισμα ἐν στάλα[ις] δυοῖν καὶ ἄν-
 5 θέμεν τὰ[μ] μὲν ἐς τὸ (ι)αρόν τοῦ [ἐν Τροζᾶνι ?] Ἀπόλλ(ω)νος
 τοῦ Θεαρίου τὰν δὲ ἐν Θεαγγέλοις εἰς τὸ ἱαρόν τῶς

Ἀθάν(α)s· τὰν δὲ βουλὰν τὰν ἵπουργίαν παρέχεν· ἄν-
δρας [δὲ] ἐλέσθαι οἵτινες τούτων ἐπιμεληθήσονται. Ἄ βου-
λὰ εἶπε· αἶρεθ(ῆ)ν(α)ι πέντε ἐπὶ τὰν στάλαν τὰν ἐν (Θε)αγγέ-
λοις Ἀριστείδῃ(ι)

10

This is the conclusion of a decree of the boulè and demos of Troezen in honour of Aristides, son of Neon of Theangela. A rider to the decree, inserted by the boulè only (lines 8-10), appointed five envoys to convey the decree to Theangela, and to see to its being inscribed there in the temple of Athena (lines 6, 7). It is worth noting that a head of Pallas appears on the obverse of one of the coins which Mr. Head inclines to attribute to Theangela (Syangela): *Hist. Num.* p. 542.

If it seems a far cry from Theangela to Troezen, it may be observed that Halicarnassus was a colony of Troezen, and an in-

scription now at Cambridge (*C.I.G.* 106) which I have endeavoured to connect with Halicarnassus (*Hellenic Journal*, 1881, ii. p. 98) is another instance, if my supposition is correct, of a close relation between Caria and Troezen in the Macedonian period. The document before us belongs apparently to the third century B.C. The extreme rarity of inscriptions from Troezen adds a further interest to this fragment. One other inscription of good age from Troezen was published in the *Bulletin de Corr. Hell.*, x. 1886, p. 136. For the temple of Apollo Thearios at Troezen, see Pausan. ii. 31, § 9.

2 (a).

ΠΑΡΕΓΕΝΟΝΤΟΕΙΣΤΗΝΠΟΛΙΝΕΚΤΩΝΕΝΠΟΛΕΜΩΙ ΕΙΡΗ
ΝΗΕΙΝΑΙΑΥΤΟΙΣΑΔΕΙΑΝΤΩΝΔΕΔΟΥΛΩΝΟΞΟΙΜΕΝΕΝ
ΕΙΡΗΝΗΠΑΝΕΓΕΝΟΝΤΟΑΙΛΥΤΟΙΣΚΑΤΑΤΑΣΣΥΝΘΗΚΑΣΤΑΣΕΝ
ΠΟΛΕΜΩΚΑΙΤΑΣΠΕΥΚΕΛΑΙΓΕΓΕΝΗΜΕΝΑΣΤΟΙΣΔΕΕΝΠΟ
ΛΕΜΩΕΛΘΟΥΣΙΝΑΔΕΙΑΝΕΙΝΑΙΑΠΟΔΟΘΗΝΑΙΔΕ

(b)

ΚΑΙΤΟΥΣΣΤΡΑΤΙΩΤΑΣΤΟΥΣΕΝΘΕΑΓΓΕΛΟΙΣΚΑΙΣΗΜΑΝΟΥ
ΜΑΙΤΑΣΣΥΝΘΗΚΑΣΑΣΠΕΠΟΙΗΜΑΙΠΡΟΣΘΕΑΓΓΕΛΟΙΣΚΑΙΑΠΟ-
ΔΩΣΩΕΣΦΡΑΓΙΣΜΕΝΑΣΘΕΑΓΓΕΛΕΥΣΙΚΑΙΟΥΚΛΩΥΣΩΤΗΝΠΟΛΙΝ
ΑΝΑΓΡΑΨΑΙΤΑΣΣΥΝΘΗΚΑΣΚΑΙΤΟΝΟΡΚΟΝΟΝΩΜΩΜΟΚΑ
ΕΝΣΤΗΛΗΚΑΙΣΤΗΣΑΙΕΝΙΕΡΩΙΩΑΝΒΟΥΛΟΝΤΑΙΕΝΘΕ
ΑΓΓΕΛΟΙΣΕΥΟΡΚΟΥΝΤΙΜΕΜΟΝΕΥΙΝΑΙΑΥΤΩ.ΚΑΙΓΕΝΕΙ
ΕΠΟΡΚΟΥΝΤΙΔΕΤΑΝΑΝΤΙΑΤΟΥΤΩΝ.

(a)

. [ὅσοι μὲν ἐλεύθεροι
παρεγένοντο εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐκ τῶν ἐν πολέμῳ [ῆ?] εἰρή-
νῃ εἶναι αὐτοῖς ἄδειαν· τῶν δὲ δούλων ὅσοι μὲν ἐν
εἰρήνῃ πα(ρ)εγένοντο [εἶν]αι αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὰς συνθήκας τὰς ἐν
πολέμῳ καὶ τὰς ΠΕΥΚΕΛΑΙ γεγενημένας, τοῖς δὲ ἐν πο-
5 λέμῳ ἐλθοῦσιν ἄδειαν εἶναι, ἀποδοθῆναι δὲ

(b)

. . . καὶ τοὺς στρατιώτας τοὺς ἐν Θεαγγέλοις, καὶ σημανοῦ-
μαι τὰς συνθήκας ὥς πεποίημαι πρὸς Θεαγγέλ(ε)ῖς καὶ ἀπο-
δώσω ἐσφραγισμένας Θεαγγελεῦσι, καὶ οὐ κωλύσω τὴν πόλιν
ἀναγράψαι τὰς συνθήκας καὶ τὸν ὄρκον ὃν (δ)μώμοκα
ἐν στήλῃ καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἱερῷ ᾧ ἂν βούλ(ω)νται ἐν Θε-
5 αγγέλοις· εὐορκοῦντι μέμ(μ)ο(ι) εὐ[ε]ῖ(η) [κ]αὶ αὐτῷ καὶ γένει,
ἐπ[ε]ορκοῦντι δὲ τὰναντία τούτων.

It is disappointing to possess only these fragments of what must have been a very interesting document. From these scanty remains we may infer that Caria had been disturbed by warfare (*a*, lines 1, 4), and that the citizens of Theangela had been found in opposite camps: such a state of things may easily have come to pass, for example, when Antigonos in B.C. 313 subdued the satrap Asander and 'liberated' the Carian cities (Droysen, *Hellenismus*, ii. 2, pp. 29, 30). Caria changed masters several times within the following century, when a similar situation may have recurred (Droysen, *ibid.* iii. 2, p. 21); if the citizens of Theangela, like those of other Greek towns, fell naturally into a democratic and an oligarchic party, the two factions might easily have been found fighting on different sides. Our inscription records the peaceful settlement of the conflict. The party that had been master of the town throughout agree to give indemnity to all citizens of whatever party who had come back into the town whether during the conflict, or after their cause was lost and hostilities had ceased (*a*, lines 1, 2). Slaves of the defeated side who had quitted the field before the

decisive blow was struck (*ἐν πολέμῳ*, line 4) are also to have indemnity, but are to be restored to their owners (line 5); they are not to be rewarded with their liberty. Slaves who came back to Theangela after the defeat of their party (*ἐν εἰρήνῃ*, line 3) are to be dealt with as provided in a certain agreement made while the war was proceeding and another agreement made at ΠΕΥΚΕΛΑ. This last word seems to be wrongly transcribed. The only Peukela known to ancient geography was a city in India intra Gangem which surrendered to Alexander the Great (Arrian, *Anab.* iv. 28, § 6). Possibly our MS. copy may conceal the name of a Carian town mentioned by Stephanus Byz. s.v. Πευγέλασος· πόλις Καρίας. τὸ ἔθνικόν Πευγελασσίς.

b contains the concluding formulae of the oath to be taken by members of the defeated party upon being readmitted to the city and its franchise. The imprecation with which it ends follows the usual phraseology in such cases: compare Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, No. 79 *fin.*; *ibid.* No. 171, lines 68 foll., and lines 77 foll.; *C.I.A.* ii. No. 49, and p. 319.

3.

ΤΟΥΒΑ
ΥΤΩΙΤΕΚ
ΤΟΥΗΦΙΣΜΑ
ΚΑΙΣΤΗΣΑΙΕΝ
5 ΑΝΑΓΡΑΥΕΔΕΑΥ
ΡΟΙΕΟΛΙΤΑΙΚΑΙΠΡΟΣ
ΤΑΙΑΝΑΓΕΓΡΑΜΜΕΝΟΙΕΙΣΙΝΑΡ
ΛΑΙΔΕΑΥΤΩΙΚΑΙΞΕΤΜΑΜΕΛΙΤΟΣ
10 ΦΟΡΙΣΚΟΥΣΔΥΟΤΟΔΕΑΝΑΛΩΜΑΤΟΣ
ΤΑΥΤΑΔΟΝΤΩΝΟΤΑΜΙΕΛΕΣΟΑΙΔ
ΚΑΙΠΡΕΣΒΕΥΤΑΣΤΡΕΙΣΟΙΤΙΝΕΣΤΟΤΕΥΗ
ΦΙΣΜΑΑΡΟΔΩΣΟΥΣΙΝΚΑΙΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΟΥ
ΣΙΝΑΥΤΟΝΤΗΝΕΥΝΟΙΑΝΠΑΡΕΧΕΣΘΑΙ
15 ΤΗΡΟΛΕΙΠΡΕΣΒΕΥΤΑΡΑΤΡΟΚΛΗΣΑΝΤΙΓ
ΝΟΥΣΝΕΑΡΧΟΣΚΤΗΣΙΚΛΕΟΥΣΙΣΜΗΝΙΑΣ
ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΥ

5 τοῦ βασιλέως ἡ...δεδοσθαι δὲ α-
ὐτῷ τε καὶ ἐκγόνοις· ἀναγράψαι δὲ
τὸ ψήφισμα [τοῦτο ἐν στήλῃ λιβύῃ
καὶ στήσαι ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀθῆνας· (ἡ)
ἀναγράψ(αι) δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ὅπου οἱ ἔτε-
ροι (π)ολίται καὶ πρόξ(ε)νοι καὶ εὐεργέ-
ται ἀναγεγραμμένοι εἰσὶν· ἀ(π)οστ(ε)ῖ-

10

λαι δὲ αὐτῶ καὶ ξέ(νι)α μέλιτος [ἀμ-
φορίσκους δύο· τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα τὸ εἰς
ταῦτα δόντων οἱ] ταμί[αι]· ἐλέσθαι δ[ὲ]
καὶ πρεσβευτὰς τρεῖς οἵτινες τὸ τε ψή-
φισμα ἀποδώσουσιν καὶ παρακαλοῦ-
σιν αὐτὸν τὴν εἵνοιαν παρέχεσθαι
τῇ πόλει. Πρεσβευτα(ί) Πατροκλῆς Ἀντιγ[έ-
νους, Νέαρχος Κτησυκλέους, Ἰσμηνίας
Μενάνδρον.

15

This is the close of a decree granting honours to a benefactor of the city. The wording follows the usual formulae, with the exception of the 'two jars of honey' (lines 9, 10), to which I can quote no parallel.

This inscription has been previously printed, but incompletely, in the *Hellenic Journal*, vi. p. 251.

E. L. HICKS.

ACQUISITIONS OF BRITISH MUSEUM.

Those who know the Berlin collection of Greek painted vases are probably acquainted with a little miniature lekythos of the 'Protokorinthian' style (no. 336 of the Berlin *Catalogue*) which represents Herakles shooting arrows at four Centaurs, and which Furtwängler in his publication of it (*Arch. Zeitung* 41, 1883, p. 154) justly describes as a pearl of the Berlin Museum. This lekythos, though only .068 metre in height, has on it three bands of pattern and the frieze of five figures which occupy the main portion of the body: for the richness and minute delicacy of its workmanship the Berlin vase has been till now unrivalled; the only specimen which could approach it was a lekythos in the British Museum of similar fabric, representing three herdsmen attacking two lions who have overthrown a bull: this lekythos was acquired with the collection of Sir W. Temple; it is engraved on the same plate (10, *ibid.*) with the Berlin specimen, but is much inferior to its companion.

The Department of Antiquities has recently acquired a lekythos, through the generosity of Mr. Malcolm Macmillan, which completely eclipses even the Berlin example. It is of the same fabric and technique in every respect, it is probably also from Korinth, and nearly contemporary: and, as if intended to challenge comparison, it is of almost identically the same size. In point of execution and refinement, however, Mr. Macmillan's lekythos is incomparably the finer of the two. On this Lilliputian masterpiece wealth of ornament has been lavished to an extent which is nothing less than marvellous. It is as if a master of vase-painting had set himself to outdo the engraver of gems in his own special cunning of hand.

The head and neck of the lekythos are here replaced by the finely modelled head of a lion, whose open mouth forms the spout of the vase. A broad band with ribbed centre, passing at the back from the shoulder to the forehead of the lion, forms a handle to the vase which in its peculiar treatment suggests an origin in metal. This handle is painted with a triple plait pattern, terminated at the top by a cross-piece of double plait, which leaves a nearly circular space between the ears of the lion: within this space is an archaic mask of the Gorgon, with grinning teeth and protruding tongue.

On the shoulder is an elaborate palmette pattern, and below this, separated from one another by triple lines of brown, come the friezes of figures.

The uppermost and most important frieze (.02 m. wide) contains no less than eighteen warriors in com-

bat: all are armed with low-crested helmets, circular shields, greaves and spears: six out of their number are kneeling, and in this position are speared in the neck by the opponents behind them, so that the blood spurts out over the shields of the kneeling figures: all the warriors with one exception are turned to the left, and the scene is possibly thus intended to suggest the surprise of an ambushade by an enemy coming from behind: the kneeling warriors certainly have the appearance of being taken unawares. Each of the shields has a different device, beautifully drawn: as a rule these consist of the kind of subjects with which we are familiar upon Korinthian aryballi, such as swans, flying birds, cocks, the forepart of a ram or bull, the mask of a bull, &c.: but there is one winged animal which seems a *μυεόθηρ* of a kind which I fail at present to understand.

The second frieze (exactly .01 m. wide) represents a horse-race. Six horses gallop at full speed to the left, ridden by boys who ply the goad freely. Beneath one of the horses is seated a swan, beneath another an ape (?).

The third frieze, perhaps the most surprising of all, is only 4 millimètres wide, and yet the artist has not only put eight figures in it, but has been able to bestow on them all the spirit and elaborate finish which he has displayed throughout the wider spaces: nearly all the figures have the outlines engraved around the paint. Behind a net, represented by a triskeles of spirals, crouch a huntsman and his dog: the huntsman swings over his head his knotted stick ready to strike the hare which two hounds are chasing into the net to the left. On the right is a fox, which has just been caught by the foremost of two other hounds.

Below this scene is a band of alternate purple and black rays, and then two brown lines surrounding the foot. On the under surface of the foot is a tiny rosette of eight petals, alternating purple and black.

The vase is beyond doubt the finest of its class yet known, and is a most welcome addition to the National Museum. It is a piece such as must, apart from its archaeological interest, appeal strongly to the artist and the amateur: Mr. Macmillan is therefore all the more deserving of thanks for his public-spirited gift.

CECIL SMITH.

Römische Mittheilungen, 1888, part 4. Rome.

1. Jatta: a r.f. vase of the Jatta collection, representing the contest of Thamyris with the Muses (Michaelis, *Thamyris und Sappho*, from an imperfect

drawing): the figure inscribed $\Sigma\Lambda\Theta$ cannot be Sappho because (i.) her presence is not appropriate in this scene, (ii.) at least one letter is probably missing before this inscription: she is probably one of the attendants of Aphrodite Paregoros (?); the attitude of Thamyris leaves the issue still in doubt, but he is represented in the guise of victor in the Delphian festival: plate. 2. Michaelis: the antiquities of Rome as described by Nicolas Muffel in 1452: this MS., now in Munich, was published in an inaccessible form in 1876: it is interesting for its account of the seven principal churches and for a notice of the more remarkable antiquities: Muffel seems to have studied Poggio 'de varietate fortunae,' but otherwise describes what he saw without much previous knowledge. 3. Studniczka: the archaic statues of Artemis from Pompeii. The so-called 'archaistic' statues are worthy of study for the construction of the history of early art: the cult statue of the huntress Artemis from Pompeii is a case in point. This is in composition and style the reflection of a work of the time of the Persian Wars, very slightly altered by a copyist of early Imperial times: the small size and spirited movement suit this, and the date agrees with its mythological type: we know from coins, a bronze of Dodona, &c., that far back into the fifth century the free representation of the striding huntress took shape beside the Eastern-Greek cult statue of the beast-holding $\pi\acute{\omicron}\tau\tau\upsilon\alpha\ \theta\eta\rho\acute{\omega}\nu$. Most of the details of treatment, the measurements of proportion, the hair, head-dress, folds of dress and remains of colour, correspond with the true archaic. The best evidence for the completeness of this copy is the replica in Venice, which might have come from the same studio, and is probably from Rome: probably the original of both was well known in Rome. The same statue is represented on a wall-painting of the Farnesina Gardens, coloured green, like bronze—this gives evidence for the reconstruction of the type with a box in the left hand, as does also a relief in the Palazzo Spada: not, as Friedrichs supposed, a torch. The painting also shows us the time when the original was exciting interest in Rome: the scene in which it occurs also seems to point to its connection with a victory in war. The same type occurs on certain coins of Augustus (except that there the right hand is raised to the quiver; a difference which is probably constructive). Under it is always SICIL, an allusion (as Eckhel noted) to the battle of Artemisium Siciliæ. It possibly reproduces a Sicilian cult statue connected with the place: but probably it is connected with the Kalydonian Artemis of Paus. 7. 18. 9. Plate and three cuts. 4. Petersen: the bust of Commodus, now in the Museo Capitolino, forms a group with the two marine Centaurs found with it: they were published separately by Visconti, who supposed the centre occupied by a missing Neptune. Though of different marble and merit, they are of same date. Such a group is frequent on sarcophagi: as a rule the supporting figures carry a shield, shell, &c., on which is the bust; but here they carry the bust itself: the lion's skin gives a background. It would thus suit the decoration of a pediment. The crouching Amazons under the bust probably represent provinces: the globe beside them indicates the heavens: the whole is thus symbolic of earth, sea, and sky: cut. 5. Mommsen: adduces two passages confirming the adoption of three names by the liberti of Trajan: and corrects the date attributed to an inscription of the cemetery of Concordia.

Record of meetings of the Institute, with summaries of papers read, and three cuts. C. S.

Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma, 1888. Rome.

Part XI. 1. Gatti: discoveries topographical and epigraphical: including an interesting description recording the restoration of the sepulchral monument of a *synodus psaltrum* (college of scenic musicians) by their *curator*, M. Licinius Mena. 2. Visconti: discoveries of works of art and antiquities: in Aug.-Nov. were found in different parts of Rome a number of monuments, of which he gives a brief description: the most notable are—a statue of the Good Shepherd, a rare example of Christian art of the third century: a marble statue of a river god, life size, fine work: a colossal marble trophy, consisting of a Roman cuirass, in good preservation: and a bronze disk with an incised representation, probably of Louis IX of France. Bibliography. C. S.

Part XII. 1. Marucchi: the recent discoveries near the cemetery of S. Valentino on the Via Flaminia (concluded from p. 240): announces the finding of the basilica erected in the fourth century by Pope Julius I near the tomb of S. Valentino: with a large number of inscriptions, principally sepulchral, from the adjoining cemetery: two plates. 2. Visconti: list of objects discovered during 1888 by the Commissione, and preserved in the Campidoglio or Communal magazines. C. S.

Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. January-February, 1889. Athens and Paris.

1. Holleaux: gives the eleven inscriptions now known which record dedications to different divinities by members of the second Boeotian confederation: seven were previously published, the remaining four were found by him in the temenos of Apollo Ptoos: for various reasons he assigns the first four to the last years of the fourth century, B.C.: the remainder (except one which is fragmentary) belong to the latter part of the third or early in the second century, A.C. Fifteen cities are named, of which four are new as adherents of the league. The chief magistrate ($\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\alpha\upsilon\ \beta\omicron\iota\omega\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$) might be chosen from any town, but was usually a Theban. The delegates, $\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, are usually seven in number: in one case there are eight, the additional name being that of a Chalcidian: probably this marks the period when Chalcis was annexed to the league. Some of the towns seem to have the permanent right to elect a delegate: in the others, the right of representation is not constant, and is probably held in participation. The office of scribe, $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$, is not mentioned in the first group, and was probably only created in the third century: he always represents a town apart from the other delegates. The $\mu\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\varsigma$, charged with consulting the oracles in the name of the league, seems, as Foucart supposed, to be exclusively chosen from a priestly family of Thespieæ. 2. Cousin and Diehl: four inscriptions of Iasos and three of Bargylia. 3. Collignon: two marble heads of the third century, B.C., from Arcesine: the one is probably that of Zeus, not, as was supposed, of Asklepios: the other, a female head, cannot be attributed with certainty. A third head, from Minoa, is a portrait of the latter part of the second century, A.D.: the ivy wreath probably has some reference to the cult of Dionysos: two plates. 4. Doublet: inscriptions from Crete. 5. Lechat: a leaden imprecatory inscription in a private collection at Athens: condemns a certain helmet-maker ($\kappa\rho\alpha\upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\delta\iota\varsigma$) and his wife, a gilder ($\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\omega\tau\epsilon\pi\lambda\alpha$): incomplete. 6. Semitelos: emendations to Euripides: Medea, 708, 856; Hecuba, 96, 97, 398, 1064, 1214; Hippol. 661, 1090; Iph. Aul. 446, 451, 508, 947, 973, 1110, 1168, 1185, 1379, 1550, 1577, 1589, 1592, 1594, 1596; Iph. Taur. 15,

81, 113, 120, 226, 343, 352, 452, 492, 525, 529, 558, 572, 687, 707, 731, 759. 7. S. Reinach: (i) The statue of a warrior found by him in Delos (*Bulletin*, 1884, p. 179), with a base inscribed with the name of Agasias: it probably formed part of a group with a mounted warrior of whose horse fragments were found: the warrior was probably a barbarian, though this cannot be proved: it bears a striking analogy with the Borghese warrior, and with the Attalid groups. Possibly the group was dedicated, as the inscription seems to show, by the Roman merchants of Alexandria in honour of a Roman legatus. (ii) A statue of the Louvre, somewhat analogous in attitude and style, representing a wounded Gaul: formerly in the Borghese collection. Two plates. 8. Lechat: excavations on the Acropolis: notice of the sculptures in tufa, specially the groups of Herakles and Triton, Typhon, and the lions and bull. 9. Mylonas: an Attic decree of proxenia B.C. 408. 10. Foucart: inscriptions from the Akropolis: three refer to Aphrodite Pandemos, whose title is probably derived from a Semitic source: no. 7 refers to the chryselephantine statue of Athene. 11. S. Reinach: three inscriptions (now disappeared) from Bencha (*anc. Athribis*) relative to a Jewish community of that place. 12. Various epigraphical notes. C. S.

The same. March 1889.

1. Jamot: inscriptions of Argolis: the first is a dedication by certain *φρουροι*, probably soldiers sent early in the fifth century by the Aeginetans to watch the Epidaurians: the eighteenth is a decree of Troezen about 243 B.C., in honour of Aratos, chief of the Achaean League. 2. Semitelos: emendations to Euripides, continued: Iph. Taur. 819, 856, 914, 935, 1246, 1308, 1309, 1371; Elektra, 1, 43, 96, 140, 268, 498, 508, 545, 546, 564, 566, 605-7; Orestes, 117, 147, 249, 277, 398, 434, 904, 1040, 1045; Phoin. 21. 3. Paris: marble statue of Artemis found by him at Delos in 1884: compares it with the *ex voto* of Nikandra, between which and the other archaic statues of Artemis its date must be placed: plate. 4. Holleaux: a new dedication of the Boeotian league, from the temenos of Apollo Ptoos: it dates between 223 and 192 B.C., and seems incomplete, mentioning only five delegates and no *μάντις*: the mention of Copae brings the list of towns up to sixteen. He restores no. 6 of his previous article. 5. Fougeres: excavations at Delos: (i) Decrees of proxenia and honorary: (ii) Decrees of cleruchi. 6. Foucart: a decree from the Akropolis in honour of the Ephebi of 333 B.C.: it mentions a *λεβὴν Κέκροπος*, which must have been a temenos in the open air, separate from the tomb of Kekrops: and throws new light on several points in connection with the Athenian *ἐφῆβεια*. To this are added two other ephebi inscriptions from the Peiraeus. 7. Fougeres: inscription relating to the league of the Magnes of Thessaly, honouring the secretary of the *συνέδριον*: the chief magistrates are the *στρατηγός*, the board of generals (*συνάρχαι τῶν στρατηγῶν*), and the *νομοφύλακες*, both varying in number: the *ταμίαι*, a finance minister: these are the *κοινὸι ἄρχοντες*. The legislative power is vested in a committee of *συνέδριον*, who have a *γραμματεὺς*, and whose decisions are ratified by the federal assembly; the town of Demetrias is the headquarters of the league, and their chief deity is Zeus Akraios. 8. Epigraphical notes. C. S.

Gazette Archéologique. 1888. Nos. 11-12. Paris.

1. Svoronos: Ulysses among the Arcadians, and the Telegonia of Eugeammon: (i) certain coin-types of Mantinea which have been described as a fisherman or Dionysos represent Ulysses fixing the oar in the ground according to *Odyssey A*, 121-134: (ii) the

Telegonia is mostly plagiarised from Musaeus and other writers: part of it is based on a misunderstanding of the word *ἔταλος*: Eugeammon is scarcely mentioned by ancient authors: it is in the first book that we must place the episode above mentioned, not in the second, as Welcker and others thought: (iii.) there is no indication in other writers that Ulysses went into Epirus to seek the man foretold by Tiresias: (iv) but he went into Arcadia, after the answer given by Trophonios, and this explains the Mantinea coins: and is further borne out by other Arcadian myths: (v) an episode of the battle of Leuktra explains why this type was adopted, and fixes the date of these coins at B.C. 370, the date of the reconstruction of Mantinea: plate containing twelve cuts. 2. Six: vases with polychrome paintings on a black ground (continued): completes his list of vases of this class, with results which point to their having been made at Athens previously to B.C. 480. In an appendix he explains a series of sketches illustrating the successive movements of the diskobolos, made from his own experiences: two plates in previous part. 4. Babelon: publishes two appliqué figures of bronze in the *Cabinet des Médailles*: they are archaistic, probably from a procession of figures in relief, and from analogy with the Villa Albani sarcophagus, and the Corinth puteal, may be called Hera and Hebe: plate. 6. Heiss: a Celtiberian plate of terra-cotta found at Segovia: judging from the inscription, it was made in the south of Spain early in the time of Augustus: compares the characters here written with those of other Iberian monuments: plate, and six cuts. News, bibliography, &c. C. S.

Antike Münzbilder. By Dr. F. Imhoof-Blumer (reprinted from the *Jahrbuch des kais. deutschen archäol. Instituts*. Bd. III. 1888, viertes Heft.). 1. A curious series of coins, chiefly Greek, on which appear figures in the act of prayer or entreaty. II. Zeus myths at Laodicea (Phrygia). III. An interesting representation of the Judgment of Paris on a coin of Scepis in the Troad, now for the first time correctly described. IV. 'Gründungsage von Ephesos.'—Representations of a mountain-god Peion &c. V. Representations of mountain-gods &c.

Annuaire de la Soc. française de Numismatique. Vol. xii. 1888, concluding part.

A. de Belfort, 'Recherches des monnaies impériales romaines non décrites dans l'ouvrage de H. Cohen' (continued). Describes coins of Maximian Hercules, and Carausius.—L. Blancard. De l'apparition du grain 6912 à la livre de 12 onces.

Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique. Jan.—Feb. 1889.

Oreschnikow. 'A propos d'une nouvelle détermination des monnaies au monogramme BAE.' Th. Reinach lately attributed the bronze coins with this monogram to some unknown King of Bosphorus of the first half of the first century A. D. Oreschnikow maintains the opinion previously held by himself and other numismatists that these coins were issued by Mithradates the Great ('*Basileus Eupator*') for Bosphorus. There are some decided objections to Reinach's view.—The 'Chronique' contains an account of the 'Trésor de Kiev,' Roman coins found at Kiev in 1876.

Revue Numismatique. Premier trimestre, 1889. F. Lépaule. 'La monnaie romaine à la fin du Haut-Empire,' (2nd. part.)—Review of Greenwell's 'Cyzicus' by E. Babelon.

Numismatic Chronicle, 3rd. ser. Vol. viii. 1888, part 4.

H. Howorth. 'The Eastern Capital of the Seleucidae.' Suggests that the Eastern Capital of the Seleucid Kings was Nissa (Nyssa) or Dionysopolis, the capital of Parthiene or Parthia. Here probably were struck the early Seleucid coins (chiefly from the Oxus find) bearing the letters Δ or ΔΙ and not—as Prof. Gardner has conjectured—at Dionysopolis or Nyssa, a city of Paropamisus identified by Cunningham with Begram near Cabul.—B. V. Head. 'Germanicopolis and Philadelphia in Cilicia.' Describes an

important and unpublished bronze coin bearing the head of Caligula and the name of Germanicopolis as well as that of the neighbouring Philadelphia. The coin is also inscribed with the name of Xanthus 'Ιεπεύς, and was probably issued under his authority. A map of the valley of the Calycadnus is added.—C. Oman. 'A new type of Carausius.' *Obv.* Bust of Carausius. *Rev.* HERC DEVSENIENSI (retrograde) Hercules Deuseboniensis standing, with club and patera. This Hercules was hitherto only known on the coins of Postumus.

WARWICK WROTH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Hermes, vol. xxiv., part 1, contains:

1. M. Rothstein, *Properz und Vergil*. (1) A discussion of the lines at the end of the last elegy of Book II. from 59 to the end. The chief points maintained are (a) 61–62 refer to some projected epic of Vergil, not to anything in the *Aeneid*. (b) In 79 *late carmen* refers not to the *Georgics*, but to Vergil's poetry generally. (γ) 81–82 need no transposition and refer not to Vergil, but to the love-poems of Propertius himself, as also does the 'haec' repeated four times in the lines which follow. (δ) 83–84 should be read and punctuated as follows: 'Nec minor his, animis aut sim minor ore, canorus Anseris in docto carmine cessit olor.' (ε) The whole poem leads up to the insertion of Propertius himself in the ranks of erotic poets, and all that is said of Lynceus tends towards this result. (2) Several half-conscious reproductions by Propertius of Vergilian phrases are noticed, and two passages containing definite Vergilian allusions: (a) In iii. 10, 25 the reference to Ascrea and Permessus, as representing two different kinds of poetry, receives its explanation from Verg. *Ecl.* vi. 64 *sqq.* (b) In i. 11, 18 the expression 'timetur amor' (altered by Lachmann into 'veretur amor') is a reminiscence of Verg. *Ecl.* iii. 109–10, 'quisquis amores aut metuet dulces,' &c., where 'amorem meture' is explained as almost 'to have love's fears.' Conf. Propert. ii. 34, 25, 'insanire amorem.' (3) Several phrases of Vergil in the *Aeneid* seem to have been taken from Propertius—(a) *Aen.* i. 46 from ii. 2, 6: (b) *Aen.* xii. 848 from iii. 12, 5: and perhaps (γ) *Aen.* v. 150 from i. 3, 31.

2. G. Kaibel, *Zur Attischen Komödie*. (1) Phrynichus' *Ephialtes*. Though the Alexandrian critics regard Phrynichus as among the ἀξιολόγηταί of the old comedians, he was not favourably regarded by Aristophanes and Hermippus. Possibly this was due to attacks made on the comic poets by Phrynichus, who appears to have been a critic in the departments of poetry and music. From a fragment of the *Ephialtes* preserved in Athenaeus (iv. 165b) Kaibel tries to show that the play was probably an attack on the comic poets, who are alluded to under the term ἡδύλογοι. Possibly a passage of Aelian (*de anim.* 10, 41) has reference to the plot of the play, where a slave named Ephialtes steals some poems of a fellow-slave named Eupolis. (2) *Archippos und die Pergamenische Kritik*. Four plays, the Πόλις, the Διδυμὸς Ναυαγίας, the Νῆσοι and the Νίος, though traditionally assigned to Aristophanes, were by some ancient critics assigned to Archippus. Of these the two former are never quoted by Alexandrian scholars as plays of Aristophanes, while the two latter are, and the first intimation of any doubt of them comes in a passage of Pollux (9, 89) in reference to the Νῆσοι, no doubt derived from some scholar of the

Pergamene School. But why should these plays rightly or wrongly be assigned to Archippus? The answer according to Kaibel lies in the close resemblance between the 'Fishes' of Archippus (as seen in the fragments) and the 'Birds' of Aristophanes, and also to a less degree in the resemblance between the two plays entitled Πλότος written by the two poets, so that Archippus had the reputation of being a clever imitator of Aristophanes. Then follows an interesting discussion as to the triple division of Attic comedy into *old*, *middle* and *new*, which depended on difference of material, and its two-fold division into *old* and *new*, depending on distinctions of style and rhetorical form. This latter was the point of view of the Pergamene School of critics, who probably applying this method to the four plays in question attributed them to Archippus rather than to Aristophanes.

3. F. Leo, *Varro und die Satire*. The chapter in Diomedes περὶ ποιημάτων (p. 485) begins 'Satira dicitur carmen apud Romanos nunc quidem maledicium et ad carpenda hominum vitia archaicae comediae characterē compositum quale scripsit Lucilius.' Leo discusses whether this statement is derived from Varro or from Suetonius, and decides in favour of the former, whom probably Horace follows in connecting Lucilius with Eupolis, Cratinus and Aristophanes, apparently on the score of his practice ὀνομαστὶ κωμῶδειν. The argument is interesting and elaborate, and Kiessling is shown to be wrong in declaring Varro to be the original authority for the statement of Joannes Lydus (*de mag.* 1, 41) that the form of the Lucilian satire goes back to Rhinthon.

4. U. Köhler, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Pentekontactie*. The account given by Thucydides of the fifty years previous to the Peloponnesian war is supplemented to some extent by epigraphical and other material. (a) The fragmentary inscription in *C.I.A.* i. 432 containing a list of the Athenians and their allies who fell in Thasos has generally been referred to the battle of Drabeskos. Köhler argues against this view, and thinks that it may relate to the battle fought by Cimon at sea against the Persians, and narrated by Plutarch (*Cim.* 14). (b) A funeral inscription relating to a certain Pylaios who led the soldiers of three Athenian tribes safely from Pagae through Boeotia into Attica (*C. I. A.* 1675) is referred by Visconti to the Phocian war in 351 B.C. Kaibel however rightly ascribes the inscription to an earlier date, and Köhler argues that it relates to an expedition into the Megarid in the year 446 B.C., at the time when Pericles was in Euboea. (Conf. Thuc. i. 144 and Diod. xii. 526.)

5. O. Hirschfeld, *Zu Römischen Schriftstellern*. Critical notes to Cic. *ad Fam.* ix. 6, 6, *ad Att.* ix. 18, 2: Caes. *B. G.* viii. praef. § 2: Frontin. *Strat.*

iv. 3, 14, iv. 7, 40: Tac. *Ann.* i. 10: Suet. *Caes.* 28: Tib. 29: Appul. *apol.* 2: Scriptt. Hist. Aug. *Sev.* 20: *Pescen.* 1, 4: *Albin.* 4, 7: *Maxim.* 26, 6: *Aurel.* 21, 8: Mart. v. 17, 3: Juv. iv. 121.

6. A. Wilhelm, *Attische Psephismen*. A collection of twenty-three Attic ψηφίσματα, all (with the exception of no. 3, and possibly no 2) later than the archonship of Euclides. A few of them have already appeared, though less accurately, in the *C. I. A.* Most of them are ultimately to be incorporated in the supplement to Part II. of that collection. No. 2 (described in the *Sitzungsber. der Berl. Akad.* 1888, 246, v. 24) perhaps relates to the Athenian blockade of Achaia at the time of the Sicilian expedition. No. 8 is a restoration of the fragmentary inscription given in *C. I. A.* ii. 82b. No. 9 is a decree by which προεστία is granted to Apollonides of Halicarnassus, probably the same person mentioned by Demosth. *cont. Lysikr.* 33. No. 11 contains a fresh fragment forming the right half of the slab of which *C. I. A.* ii. 107 is the left. The two are here put together. No. 12 is the conjectural restoration of *C. I. A.* ii. 135b. No. 15 contains the discussion of a long ψηφίσμα on two pieces of a slab of Pentelic marble published by Tzunta, *Ep. 'Apx.* 1885, 131 ff.

Miscellen. — Th. Mommsen, *Zu Ammian und Ennodius, also Julius und Iulius*. An inscription found in 1888 in the Esquiline speaks of the son of the triumvir as Julio Antonio. This form is also established by *C. I. L.* vi. 12010, and by the MSS. of Horace. Julius was formed from this according to Lachmann's law (see ad Lucr. i. 313: and conf. villa, vilicus: mille, milia, &c.)

O. Hirschfeld, *Die Abfassungszeit der Makrobioi*. Rothstein assigns this writing of the pseudo Lucian to the fourth century. Hirschfeld assigns it on internal evidence to the reign of Caracalla between 212 and 217 A.D.

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie u. Pädagogik. Ed. Fleckeisen u. Masius. Leipzig, Teubner. 1888.

Heft 10 contains: (1) O. Höfer, *Zu den Griech. Tragikern*, defending ἀνδραγωγ in Soph. *El.* 636, proposing δάλων for ἄλων in O. T. 7, κληθεῖο for κτηθεῖο in Eur. *Hec.* 449, χήρα for λέκτρα in Hipp. 860, ἡμᾶς for ἄλλως in *Hec.* 489 (omitting 490), ῥηδές for ῥυδός in Alc. 321, κοῦρη for κοίλην in Alc. 898, and adding some testimonia to the fragments. (2) F. Blass, *Zu Tyrtaeos*, a note on the proper context of lines 2 and 3 of the third fragment of the Eunomia (Bergk). (3) J. Oerl, *Die Grosse Responsion im Rhesos*, supporting, from this play, the author's published theory that, in Sophoclean tragedy, there is a sort of strophic and antistrophic parallelism between the trimeters of one or more acts: e.g. in *Rhesos*, 78 (of 2nd episode) + 126 (of 3rd), correspond to 126 + 78 (of exode), iambic trimeters alone being counted; or in O. T. 310 trimeters between ll. 513—862 correspond to 310 between ll. 1110—1530. (4) F. Blass, *Zu Pratinas*, contending that the ὀνομασματα attributed to P. in Bergk's P. L. G. p. 557 ff. are from satyric dramas. (5) H. Stadtmüller, *Zu Eur. Iph. in Aulis*, 919—974, a long critical paper. (6) F. Blass, *Zu Archilochos*, an addition to Bergk's fr. 104. (7) H. Schütz, *Zu Aristoteles Rhetorik*, a series of critical comments. (8) M. Manitius, *Zur Anth. Latina*, critical notes from a Dresden codex to the poems Riese II. 679, 678. (9) K. Macke, *Zu Hor. Episteln* II. i., transposing l. 19 to 16 (largimur honores, te nostris etc.), omitting l. 116, proposing tuva ferentes for dura ferentem in 141, and suggesting in 173 that dossenmus is a Semitic word meaning 'bon vivant' and is applied to Plantus. (10) E. Anspach, *Zu Corn. Nepos*, a further collection of critical notes. (11)

Th. Stangl, *Lexicographische Notiz*, pointing to some unnoticed expressions in Boethius de *Syll. Categ.* I. proem. (12) M. C. P. Schmidt, *ac u. atque vor Consonanten*, a summary of the usages of Q. Curtius in this matter. (13) O. Seeck, *Zur Gesch. Diocletians u. Constantins*, No. 1., contending that of the last eight *Panegyrici*, collected in the lost Moguntine codex, at least six (all but VI. and IX.) were clearly written by Eumenius of Augustodunum. (14) F. Walter, *Zu Tac. Annalen*, critical notes.

Heft 11 contains: (1) J. Beloch, *Theognis Vaterstadt*, contending that Theognis was born about B.C. 530, in Sicilian Megara, and migrated to Nisaeon Megara after B.C. 483. (2) A. Ludwig, *Zum Hom. Hermes hymnos*, some emendations, evidently preparatory to a new edition of the Hymns. (3) F. Blass, *Solon u. Mimnermos*, pointing out that the Solonic fragments nos. 20 and 21 (Bergk) should be combined, and are an answer to some lines of Mimnermos, two of which are printed as Theogn. 1069, 1070, and two as Mimn. fr. 6. (4) F. Weck, *Zu Soph. Oed. Tyr.* 1512, proposing εἰχεσθ' ἐμοί = εἰχέσθαι ἐμοί (παρῆστι), the construction continuing thus, κυρῆσαι (τοῦ βίου) οὐ καιρὸς, λόγονος δέ κ.τ.λ. (5) J. A. Simon, *Xenophonische Studien*, on Xenophon's use of ἔχει and μέχει, and also on his 'uebergangsformeln,' such as καὶ τὰ μὲν Θετταλικά δεδήλωται. (6) K. J. Liebhold, *Zur Textkritik Platons*, a series of emendations to *Apologia*, *Kriton* and *Protagoras*. (7) Critique by H. Menge of M. Manitius' edn. of Hypsicles' *Anaphorikos*, 'deserves recognition and awakens the hope that the editor will do more work in the same field.' (8) E. Redslob, *Zu Plaut. Aulul.* 735, proposing quid ego erga te merui. (9) A. Cohn, *Zu Plaut. Miles Gloriosus* 223, proposing intercludite itinera cuncta. (10) P. Stamm, *Zur Latein. Grammatik u. Stylistik*, dealing with fifteen minor rules stated, for the most part, in the new edition of the *Antibarbarus*; e.g. the first note is on adjectival predicates common to subjects of different genders, and points out that Cicero and Caesar do not use such constructions as *Oreum et Corinthus tuenda sunt*, which Livy and Sallust admit. (11) A. Teuber, *Zu Catullus*, c. 36, explaining the poem. (12) H. Düntzer, *Zu Horatius*, a series of explanatory notes, in controversial form. (13) F. Rühl, *Die Constantinischen Indictionen*, attempting to explain the statement of the *Chronicon Pasch.* I. p. 522, that the 'Constantinian indictions' begin in the fourth consulship of Constantine, A.D. 312.

Zeitschrift für das Gymnasial-Wesen, Feb.-Mar. 1889.

In Liv. 7, 33, 2 for *comiter facilis* H. J. Müller conjectures *comis ac facilis*. The best MSS. have *comi facilis* which has arisen through a haplography from *comi fac <fac> illis*. H. Schweizer-Sidler and A. Surber *Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache* 1st. part. (H. Eichler): 'a thoroughly scientific exposition of sound-inflection and word-formation-lore in Latin' but more adapted for teachers than students: classical and non-classical usages might have been more distinguished. J. Ph. Krebs *Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache* 6 edn. by Allgayer and J. H. Schmalz 2nd. vol. 1-2 (H. S. Anton): 'shows the same solid learning, judgment and scientific method as the earlier vol.' The following additions may be made—*nisi*: in Liv. Plin. and Tac. *nec nisi* are found together, cf. Liv. 5, 46, 11: 24, 5, 12; Plin. 11 § 121: 29 § 46; Tac. *Germ.* 30, 2. *Oplare*: with inf. Cic. *fam.* 4, 6, 3 and with acc. and inf. pass. *N.D.* iii § 95. *Pulsare fores*: also Hor. *Od.* 1, 4, 13 where *tabernas* = *tabernarum fores*. *Quam non* = 'How little' and *quam* = 'how much', Cic. *Verr.* 5 § 9 and *Hirt.* 8, 44, 3. *Secus* without 'than, Cic. *Plane.* § 29. *Sequitur ergo ut* Cic. *Orat.* § 191.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

- Aeschylus*. Libation-Bearers: a Revised Text with brief English Notes for use of Schools, by F. A. Paley. New Edition. 12mo. pp. 112. Bell & Sons. 1s. 6d.
- Euripides*. Hippolytus. With Introduction and Notes by W. S. Hadley. 12mo. pp. 146. Cambridge Press. 2s.
- Lucy*. Book XXII. By Marcus S. Dimsdale. 12mo. pp. 230. Cambridge Press. 2s. 6d.
- Xenophon's Hellenica*. Book II. With Analysis and Notes. 12mo. pp. 120. Bell & Sons. 2s.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Apostolis* (Michel). Lettres inédites, publiées d'après les Manuscrits du Vatican, avec des opuscules inédits du même auteur, une introduction et des notes par H. Noiret. 8vo. 173 pp. Paris. Thorin. 7 frs.
- [Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 54.]
- Beckmann* (A.). Num Plato artefactorum ideas statuerit. 8vo. 36 pp. Bonn. Hanstein. Mk. 1.
- Böhme* (W.). Nepossätze zur Einübung der lateinischen Syntax in Quarta. 12mo. iv, 60 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. Mk. 1.
- Benndorf* (O.). Wiener Vorlegeblätter für archäologische Uebungen. 1888. Fol. (12 photolith. plates). Vienna. Holder. Boards. Mk. 12.
- Caesar*. Commentarii de bello civili edidit G. T. Paul. Editio major. 12mo. lxi, 135 pp. Leipzig. Freytag. Mk. 1.50.
- Editio minor. 12mo. vi, 135 pp. Leipzig. Freytag. Mk. —.60.
- Cicero*. Orationes selectae, scholarum in usum edidit H. Nohl. Vol. IV. pro L. Murena, pro P. Sulla, pro A. Licinio Archia orationes. Editio major. 12mo. xvi, 106 pp. Leipzig. Freytag. 80 pf.
- Editio minor. 12mo. 91 pp. Leipzig. Freytag. 50 pf.
- Coutat*. Aristophane et l'ancienne Comédie Attique. 12mo. Paris. Lecène et Oudin. 3 fr. 50.
- Favre* (J.). La Morale d'Aristote. 18mo. 392 pp. Paris. Alcan. 3 frs. 50 cts.
- Gylling* (J. A.). De argumenti dispositione in satiris IX.—XVI. Juvenalis commentatio academica. 8vo. 150 pp. Lund. Moller. Mk. 1.80.
- Klocekorn* (H.). Die Kämpfe Cäsars gegen die Helvetier im Jahre 58 v. Chr. Eine Kritik von Cäsars Darstellung in Caesaris de bello gallico I. 2—29. 8vo. 25 pp. Leipzig. Fock. Mk. —.80.
- Klohe* (P.). De Ciceronis librorum de officiis fontibus. Dissertatio inauguralis. 8vo. 39 pp. Greifswald. Mk. 1.
- Kubitschek* (J. W.). Imperium romanum tributum descriptum. 8vo. iv, 276 pp. Leipzig. Freytag. 12 Mk.
- Lucrèce*. Traduction complète en vers par Edouard Miélet, préface par G. Renard. 18mo. Paris. Perrin et Cie. 3 frs.
- Mollweide* (R.). Ueber die Glossen zu Sallust. 4to. 19 pp. Strassburg, 1888. Mk. 1.20.
- Ovid*. Carmina selecta. In usum scholarum edidit C. J. Grysar. Recognovit et auxit C. Ziwsa. 12mo. xxii, 296 pp. Vienna, 1888. Gerold's Sohn. Mk. 1.40.
- Picavet* (F.). De Epicuro novae religionis auctore sive de Diis quid senserit Epicurus. 8vo. 136 pp. Paris. Alcan.
- Plato*. Apologie des Sokrates und Kriton nebst den Schlusskapiteln des Phaidon. Für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von A. T. Christ. 12mo. xviii, 77 pp. Leipzig. Freytag. 50 pf.
- Porphyry*. Isagoge i introduzione alle Categorie di Aristotele, tradotta per la prima volta in italiano e annotata da E. Passamonti. 8vo. xvi, 90 pp. Pisa. Nistri & Co. 4 lire.
- Rönnberg* (W.). Das Erbrecht von Gortyna. Inaugural Dissertation. 8vo. 41 pp. Stillier, Rostock. 1888. Mk. 1.20.
- Rösch* (H.). Semasiologische Beiträge zum lateinischen Wörterbuch. 3tes (Schluss) Heft: Verba. 8vo. 86 pp. Leipzig. Fues. Mk. 3.
- Sallust*. Bellum Jugurthinum. Scholarum in usum recognovit R. Novák. 12mo. vi, 90 pp. Prag, 1888. Storch Sohn. 72 pf.
- Schmitt* (P.). Ueber den Ursprung des Substantivsatzes mit Relativpartikeln im Griechischen. 8vo. Würzburg. Stuber's Verlag. Mk. 3.
- [Schanz Beiträge zur histor. Syntax der Griechischen Sprache. Heft 8.]
- Seneca*. Suasorie VI. Préfaces des controverses. Extraits d'une traduction complète et inédite de Sénèque le Rhéteur par A. Damien. 12mo. Paris. Pedone-Lauriel. 2 fr. 50.
- Silius Italicus*. Le Puniche. Traduzione con proemio e note di Onorato Occioni, con testo a fronte corredato delle principali varianti del codice Casanatense. 2da edizione riveduta e corretta. 2 vols. xxiii, 555 and 588 pp. Torino. E. Loescher. 30 lire.
- Studien*, Leipziger, zur classischen Philologie. Herausgegeben von O. Ribbeck, H. Lipsius, C. Wachsmuth. Vol. XI. Part 2. 8vo. v, 207—357 pp. Leipzig. Hirzel. Mk. 4.
- Sybel* (L.). Platon's Technik. An Symposion und Euthydem nachgewiesen. 8vo. vii, 46 pp. Marburg. Elwert. Mk. 1.20.
- Tacitus*. Germania, Agricola, dialogus de oratoribus. Scholarum in usum recensuit R. Novák. 12mo. 100 pp. Prag. Storch Sohn. Mk. 1.20.
- Taillebois* (E.). Epigraphie gallo-romaine. Quelques marques de potiers trouvées dans les départements des Landes et du Gers. 8vo. 11 pp. Plates. Dax, Lebègue.
- Thiaucourt* (C.). Les Historiens latins et particulièrement Tacite. 8vo. 32 pp. Paris. Hachette et Cie.
- Treuber* (O.). Beiträge zur Geschichte der Lykier. Teil II. 4to. 47 pp. Tübingen, 1888. Fues. 2 Mk. [Contents: I. Wesen der Gräberbussen Lykiens, ihr Verhältniss zu den übrigen in griechischer Sprache und zu den römischen. II. Nachrichten zu Treuber, Geschichte der Lykier.]
- Valentini* (W.). Iscrizione dolari latine; di un bollo figulino rinvenuto in Bomarzo. 8vo. pp. 15. Ovieto. Tipogr. Tosini.
- Wiss* (W.). Die Sprichwörter bei den römischen Komikern. 8vo. 114 pp. Zürich. Schulthess. Mk. 2.